

**21st Century Transportation
Infrastructure Symposium:**

**Linking Regional Planning and
Operations for Effective ITS
Deployment**

Proceedings

Sponsored by:
Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration
Volpe National Transportation System Center

December 16-17, 1996
Washington, D.C.

Foreword

These proceedings are derived from the symposium entitled *21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium: Linking Regional Planning Operations for Effective ITS Deployment: Proceedings* (FHWA-SA-98-002). Until it is published, a photocopy of the forthcoming *Proceedings* may be requested from Ms. Laurel Radow, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications, HTV-3, Room 3404, 400 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20690; fax request with name, address and telephone number to 202-366-8712. The symposium was jointly sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (VNTSC), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

On December 16-17, 1996, at the Sheraton Washington Hotel in Washington, D.C., more than one hundred regional planning practitioners, systems operators, and others met to examine current practices and to consider how best to adapt those practices to link planning, operations, systems management, and traveler information to obtain the most efficient use of our surface transportation system, and to accelerate the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). The presenters and respondents were selected to share their insight and experiences.

The purpose of the symposium was to help formulate recommendations for future research, policy, legislative, and administrative actions that may be considered by our offices and other public agencies to implement ITS in a regional setting. The symposium also addressed how best to incorporate improved regional and jurisdictional transportation management and operational practices, and ITS deployment into standard regional and/or statewide planning procedures, processes and practices. Finally, the symposium focused on the important linkages between regional transportation planning and operations of proposed and existing systems to enhance interagency and interjurisdictional information sharing. These linkages will become especially important as more citizens and business and commercial carriers want regional traveler information systems in the 21st Century.

Notice

The contents of this report reflect the view of the authors who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Department of Transportation.

The United States Government does not endorse the products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear herein only because they are considered essential to the objective of this document.

This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Proceedings for Day One	3
Opening Remarks	3
Susan Lauffer, FHWA	3
<i>Summary of Remarks</i>	3
Edward Thomas, FTA	3
<i>Summary of Remarks</i>	3
Robert C. Ricci	5
<i>Summary of Remarks</i>	5
Tom Horan	5
<i>Summary of Remarks</i>	5
Key Policy Challenges and Opportunities to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information	7
Stephen Lockwood, PB Farradyne, Inc.	7
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	7
Joe Sussman, MIT	11
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	11
Hank Dittmar, STPP	13
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	13
John Cox, SCEP	14
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	14
Audience Comments for the Policy Session	15
Breakout Discussions	16
<i>Question A:</i>	16
<i>Question B:</i>	16
Breakout Group 1: Planning (Red)	17
<i>Summary of Breakout Group 1 Discussions</i>	17
<i>Recorded Information from Breakout Group 1</i>	18
Breakout Group 2: Information Systems (Green)	19
<i>Summary of Breakout Group 2 Discussions</i>	20
<i>Recorded Information from Breakout Group 2</i>	21
Breakout Group 3: Operations (Orange)	23
<i>Summary of Breakout Group 3 Discussions</i>	24
<i>Recorded Information from Breakout Group 3</i>	24
Breakout Group 4: Urban Form (Blue)	27
<i>Summary of Breakout Group 4 Discussions</i>	28
<i>Recorded Information from Breakout Group 4</i>	29
Closing Comments for Day One	31
Wayne Berman	31
Robert Stout	31
Sheldon Edner	31
Proceedings for Day Two	33
State and Local Challenges to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information	33
George Schoene, Moderator	33
John Duve, (SANDAG)	33
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	33
Les Jacobson, Washington Department of Transportation	35
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	35

Ginger Gherardi, Ventura County Transportation Commission	35
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	35
Gene Ofstead, Minnesota Department of Transportation	37
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	37
Panel Discussion of Policy and Reauthorization Implications	39
Moderator, Steve Lockwood, PB Farradyne, Inc. . .	39
Cindy Burbank, Federal Highway Admin.	39
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	39
William F. Hein, Metropolitan Transportation Commission	40
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	40
Hal Kassoff, ITS America	41
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	41
Federal Commentator: Jeff Lindley, ITS Joint Program Office	42
<i>Summary of Comments</i>	42
Federal Commentator: Robert Stout	43
<i>Summary of Comments</i>	43
Federal Commentator: Wayne Berman	43
<i>Summary of Comments</i>	43
Open Floor for Comments and Suggestions	44
Future Directions: Tom Horan	46
<i>Summary of Presentation</i>	46
Concluding Remarks: Wayne Berman	47
Attendee List	49
Appendix: Supplementary Papers	57
Luncheon Speech: Representative James L. Oberstar, ITS: Reauthorization Challenges	59
Opening Remarks: Edward L. Thomas	65
Stephen Lockwood: Policy and Technology Challenges and Opportunities	69
Joseph Sussman: Strategic Planning Issues	85
Hank Dittmar: “Technologies and Sustainability—Not Necessarily a Contradiction”	89
Dave Van Hattum: “Transportation and Information Technologies for Sustainable Technologies”	91
Janet S. Hathaway: “Commuting for Better Transit”	93
Christopher Bender: “Technology Applications for Rural America”	95
John C. Cox, Jr.: Using Advanced Information Management and Marketing Techniques to Increase the Performance and Efficiency of the Surface Transportation System	97
Gary Ritter: Planning Breakout Session	113
Thomas O. Mottl: Information Systems Breakout Report	119
Gene Ofstead: Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges	123
Ginger Gherardi: Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges	129
Lee Jacobsen: State and Local Challenges to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information	137
Sigmund Silber: 21st Century Transportation Infrastructure	

Comments	145
-----------------------	-----

Federal Highway Administration Federal Transit Administration

Volpe National Transportation System Center

**21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium:
Linking Regional Planning and
Operations for Effective ITS Deployment**

**The Sheraton Washington Hotel
Delaware Suites
December 16-17, 1996
Agenda**

Monday, December 16

- 8:45 Opening Remarks:** Wayne Berman, FHWA Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications, FHWA
DOT Representatives: Dennis Judycki, FHWA, Edward Thomas, FTA, and Dick John, Volpe Center
Symposium Overview and Direction: Tom Horan, CGSRI
- 9:15 Key Policy Challenges and Opportunities to Linking Planning, Operations Systems Management and Traveler Information:** Plenary Session
Policy and Technology Challenges and Opportunities: Stephen Lockwood, PBFI
Strategic Planning Issues: Joe Sussman, MIT
Addressing Externalities of System Performance: Hank Dittmar, STPP
Private Sector View of Systems Management: John Cox, SCEP
- 11:00 Audience Comments**
Close morning discussion: Tom Horan
- 11:30 Lunch:** Virginia Suite
Introduction: Tony Kane, FHWA
Reauthorization Challenges: Representative James Oberstar (D-MN)
- 1:15 Charge to Policy Breakout Sessions:** Wayne Berman
- 1:30 Breakout Discussions:**
Breakout 1: Moderator: Gary Ritter, Volpe
Breakout 2: Moderator: Mark Safford, Volpe
Breakout 3: Moderator: Dennis Foderberg, UMinn
Breakout 4: Moderator: Lee Munnich, UMinn
- 3:00 Breakout Sessions—Develop Synthesis for Presentation**
- 3:15 Break**

3:30 Critique of Policy Challenges and Opportunities by Breakout Sessions:
Session Moderators

4:15 Day's Closing Comments: Wayne Berman, Sheldon Edner (FHWA), Robert Stout (FTA), and Tom Horan

4:30 Day 1 Adjourns

Tuesday, December 17

8:30 Recap of Monday's Themes and Direction for Tuesday's Panels: Tom Horan

8:50 State and Local Challenges to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information:

Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges:

Gene Ofstead (MN DOT), Les Jacobson (WASH DOT), John Duve (SANDAG), and Ginger Gherardi (Ventura County Transportation Commission)

Moderator: George Schoene (FHWA)

10:00 Break

10:15 Panel Discussion of Policy and Re-authorization Implications:

DOT Representatives: Cindy Burbank (FHWA) and George Schoene (FHWA)

Outside representatives: Bill Hein (MTC) and Hal Kassoff (ITS America)

Moderator: Steve Lockwood

Commentators: Jeff Lindley (FHWA), Robert Stout, and Wayne Berman

11:15 Open Floor for Comments and Suggestions

11:40 Future Directions: Tom Horan

12:00 Adjournment of Symposium: Wayne Berman

Lunch on your own

1:30 DOT Roundtable: Macro Trends and Research Developments:

Host: Dick John, Volpe Center

Moderators: Tom Horan and Joe Sussman

Expert Roundtable: Robert Benke, Wayne Berman, David Burwell, Don Chen, John Cox, Robert Dunphy, Emil Frankel, Jonathon Gifford, Linda Howe, Tom Humphrey, Leslie Jacobson, Paul Jovanis, Stephen Lockwood, Mitchell Moss, Dick Mudge, Lee Munnich, Robert Paaswell, Edith Page, Alan Pisarski, Mike Replogle, Mike Shiffer, Stein Weissenberger, Sam Zimmerman, and others.

All symposium participants are invited to attend.

4:00 DOT Session Ends

Introduction

To foster a broader understanding of the issues, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Volpe National Transportation System Center sponsored the *21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium: Linking Regional Planning and Operations for Effective ITS Deployment*. The symposium was held December 16-17, 1996, in Washington, DC. An audience of approximately 100 transportation professionals from both the public and private sectors participated in the seminar. Several experts provided presentations, and participants met in breakout group sessions to address various issues. The two-day symposium was moderated by Wayne Berman, Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications, FHWA, and Tom Horan, Claremont Graduate School Research Institute. The agenda included the following sessions:

- Opening Remarks
- Key Policy Challenges and Opportunities to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information
- Luncheon Speaker: Representative James Oberstar (D-MN)
- Breakout Group Discussions
- Opening Remarks for Day Two
- State and Local Challenges to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information
- Panel Discussion of Policy and Reauthorization Implications
- Closing Comments

This document consists of summaries of the presentations from general sessions, participants' questions and comments, and breakout group discussions.

Proceedings for Day One

Opening Remarks

Wayne Berman of the Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications, FHWA, provided a warm welcome to the symposium participants. He reminded the audience of the transportation challenges ahead of us, and urged all participants to contribute input toward solving those challenges. Mr. Berman served as the moderator, along with Tom Horan of the Claremont Graduate School Research Institute. Mr. Horan followed with the opening remarks of the symposium.

Susan Lauffer, FHWA

Susan Lauffer is with the Federal Highway Administration. She provided comments about the importance of leadership and communication.

Summary of Remarks

We are challenged to be proactive leaders who work for and with our partners. We should stress the importance of communication and customer service, and be responsive to the needs of our customers and the public. As ITS matures toward deployment, ties to partners are important. ISTEA presents many challenges, which we will discuss today.

Edward Thomas, FTA

Edward Thomas is the Associate Administrator, Office of Research, Demonstration, and Innovation of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). He provided comments concerning the importance of various topics that are to be addressed in the symposium.

Summary of Remarks

We need to develop a stronger bond between transportation planning and operations. This will be essential if we are to realize the benefits of ITS technology. Advanced information and communication systems provide planning professionals with the opportunities to obtain data that is better and more cost-effective; models capable of analyzing short-range, multi modal, and intermodal improvements; and techniques for public involvement.

Planners, operators and system managers have roles to play. Planners have the benefits of new discoveries, such as fast, inexpensive computers; geographic information systems; global positioning satellites; multi modal network models; household and activity-based demand models; and improved optimization algorithms. Transit operators and managers are challenged with gaining a stronger understanding of their various markets, tailoring services and prices accordingly, and generally improving the quality of transit service by reducing travel time and improving safety and security. Local and state system managers are constantly reminded of the need to maintain the highest level of service on our streets, freeways, and toll roads; to provide real-time information on the condition of the system so that travelers can plan their

trips accordingly; and to offer incentives for more effective travel-demand management.

Unless ITS becomes integrated into the systems planning process by demonstrating an ability to improve planning tools and to enhance system performance, ITS risks being confined to the sidelines of transportation decision-making. As Secretary Peña called for in his announcement of Operation TimeSaver, the various ITS technologies must be integrated into a system-wide Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure (ITI). Only then can we realize the full benefits of the advanced technologies and have ITS evaluated as valid alternatives to transportation capacity improvements.

This symposium is a great step toward mainstreaming ITS. ITS integration into the transportation mainstream faces many challenges, some technical and others institutional in nature. But we have the ability to identify the critical issues and find the right solutions. FTA Administrator Linton fully supports the Department's ITS and ITI Initiatives, and is encouraging efforts to mainstream proven systems and technologies. We will work with our colleagues to ensure development of an intermodal seamless transportation system.

In closing, FTA is an important player in the Department's ITS Initiative. We have already demonstrated that information and communication-based technologies can improve safety and security, increase the throughput of transit fleets, enhance the performance of transit equipment and infrastructure, and deliver more specialized and accessible services to low income, elderly, and other transit dependent populations. To make our research, development, and innovation programs effective, our re-authorization proposal is for a joint partnership initiative.

Robert C. Ricci

Robert C. Ricci is the Deputy Director of the Volpe National Transportation System Center. He provided opening comments about ITS.

Summary of Remarks

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is an important part of 21st century transportation. We will need to conduct more research of ITS for it to function properly. In addition, ITS needs must be compatible with needs of local communities so that local government and the communities feel ownership. Communities may come to understand how ITS can increase mobility options of communications without intruding on community life.

Tom Horan

Tom Horan is the Executive Director of the Claremont Graduate School Research Institute. Dr. Horan followed with an overview and direction of the symposium.

Summary of Remarks

The symposium topic is the interface of ITS with planning and operations. The overall scope of the symposium is tactical and strategic. The tactical changes are centered around the reauthorization of ISTEA. The strategic changes include questions concerning changes in the surface transportation system and the meaning of those changes.

Key Policy Challenges and Opportunities to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management, and Traveler Information

Policy and Technology Challenges and Opportunities

Stephen Lockwood, PB Farradyne, Inc.

Stephen Lockwood, Vice President of PB Farradyne, Inc., opened the session with his analysis of 21st century transportation infrastructure.

Summary of Presentation

The agenda for 21st century transportation infrastructure is “main-streaming” ITS. The basic assumption behind this agenda is that ITS is the future of service improvements. While this broad interpretation is important, there are multiple levels of interpretation that are relevant, including immediate, programmatic needs as well as long-term, sectoral needs.

Both “evolutionary” and “visionary” points-of-view of 21st century transportation are necessary. The visionary point-of-view provides a vector for the longer-range, more aggressive 21st century transportation development. Elements of the vision need to be reflected in short-range policy such as ISTEA Reauthorization. The short-term evolutionary point-of-view accepts short-run limitations of context. The evolutionary program should consist of modifying the planning/programming process to implement the intelligent transportation infrastructure. The objective of the evolutionary program should be to deploy the intelligent transportation infrastructure nationally as a baseline. This approach assumes existing sectoral roles and complex jurisdictional structure, accepts operations as modest state/local priority, recognizes minor short-run changes, and accepts tradition of arms-length relationships with the private sector. This approach is dependent upon “champions.”

Within the near-term horizon context, potential NEXTEA ITS elements focus on generating visible deployment and capacity building. Some issues for NEXTEA include the following: operations and maintenance funding, ITS planning/programming focus, incentives for systems integration, emphasis on innovative finance, “Op tests” for operations planning, procurement deregulation, training, and research and development at the metro level. These issues are crucial to maintaining program momentum and credibility. The bottom line for NEXTEA is that we need to recognize limits of available Federal aid.

The evolutionary view of ITS is necessary, but not sufficient. There must be a visionary component, a new paradigm for 21st century surface transportation, to set the direction of future change in the “TEAs” beyond NEXTEA. This longer-range horizon vision is based on the presumption that there will be consumer demand for significant “progress” in transportation-related services in the 21st century and that the

general institutional configuration will tend towards the dominant private enterprise model.

The vision presumes a future “transportation” that is quite different from today’s transportation. In future transportation, service is the mission (not just one of many visions). Transportation will be viewed as a new product, which includes a bundle of services. It will be focused on traffic-responsive operations of the upper level network of transportation facilities in real time. It will utilize the full range of supply management tools, be combined with comprehensive in-vehicle information and safety systems, and manage demand through the provision of priced facilities and special service options. This vision implies a large number of new service components organized by information/communications into a consistent systems framework by a market-oriented combination of revenue-driven service providers.

To support the vision, major institutional and financial innovation is required. In our institutions, we will need to prioritize operations and service and develop coordinated metropolitan system operations and management. We will need to introduce enterprise management, obtain highly technical staff, and replace “planning” with performance-based evaluation. In addition, we will need to align intermodal infrastructure with modern freight logistics. In addressing financial changes, we will need to induce consumer demand with service options and prices, utilize private resources for facility operations, supplement on-budget tax funds with a range of beneficiary and customer-based revenues to support private investment, and monetize consumption of valued natural resources.

The institutional and financial changes needed may not be as radical as they seem. The context in which we are working is shifting. Other sectors, such as power and telecommunications, are moving in many of the same directions that transportation needs to move. Privatization is becoming a global trend in transportation. Innovation has been part of the U.S. transportation institution’s history, and there are already bellwether examples of innovation in the U.S. These factors in combination suggest that “progress” is inevitable. The only questions that remain are when and how.

The key barriers to the visionary future are principally institutional and financial. Some key barriers are marginally affected by limited Federal-aid program leverage and “soft” Federal-aid program incentives. Therefore, as we develop an evolutionary policy/program agenda, we also need to incorporate elements that are oriented to laying the groundwork, opening the door for significant institutional and financial change beyond NEXTEA.

The agenda beyond NEXTEA should introduce strong emphasis on evolving a suitable institutional and financial framework that brings the future forward with a focus on getting a best case rather than on raising the lowest common denominator. Transition steps that can be initiated in NEXTEA include the following:

- Raise public and service providers’ expectations through system performance focus, benchmarking, and incentives to prioritize the operational mission.

- Reduce dependence on Highway Trust Fund by permitting tolls on Interstate, and empowering regional development of pricing programs on a network basis.
- Focus on institutional innovation for operations and management through “Institutional Op Tests” such as new incentives through “Metropolitan Operating Authorities” for upper-level systems on an enterprise basis.
- Create strong dialogue toward national cooperation with service provider/players at national level to minimize barriers to in-vehicle and related communications services.
- Promote dialogue concerning cross-sectoral support at the national level of substantial operations and management costs associated with ITS for transportation-related service providers.
- Consider stronger incentives to induce private investment in both facility ownership and service provisions by minimizing public subsidy of potential enterprise-based activities. “Make” markets by developing “take or pay” approaches to activities conventionally provided by the public sector.
- Give incentives to state and local experimentation by bellwether states outside the Federal-aid program context via funded Technical Experiment Program (TE) and “Op tests” that focus on premium-priced services, streamlined procurement, and new types of concessions for both roadway improvements and ITS services.
- Encourage transition to private management by staging through managed competition, shadow prices, and franchises with new “public interest rules.”
- Undertake examination of infrastructure operations implications of contemporary logistics jointly with private freight/intermodal industry.
- Consider ITS requirements on NAFTA/Intercontinental Highway System with ATMS/ATIS requirements and Mexican and Canadian continuity.
- Establish an ITS Academy.

The above concepts should be embodied in policies and programs at both Federal and state levels. In particular, their inclusion in the national Economic Crossroads Transportation Efficiency Act (NEXTEA) will establish some important vectors that subsequent policy and program evolution can build on towards realization of the 21st century vision.

Strategic Planning Issues

Joe Sussman, MIT

Joe Sussman is a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). He presented information concerning the difficulties and challenges associated with ITS.

Summary of Presentation

ITS at its heart is a simple concept: it is “transportation as a linked vehicle/infrastructure *system*.” Linked systems are evident in the “ITS-4” Technologies, which include technologies for sensing, communicating, processing, and methods. ITS provides many advantages but it also presents several difficulties, which include systemic difficulties, organizational readiness, funding, and political realities.

The very characteristic of being systemic creates difficulties. To function as a system, ITS requires a level of coordination that we’ve never had before. For example, vehicles (which are primarily private sector) and infrastructure (which is primarily public sector) must be considered together as part of the system and must be linked together in a technologically sophisticated way. Resources must come from both the public and the private sectors and be integrated as part of the system. Public and private sector representatives must achieve a level of coordinated decision-making that has not yet been reached.

Another difficulty with ITS is organizational readiness. To reach organizational readiness, we need to create a new cadre of transportation professionals that can deploy new technologies. Many professionals currently place emphasis on operations, maintenance, and construction rather than on ITS. There is evidence of a move in the right direction, but there is much further to go to achieve organizational readiness. To accomplish this goal, academia, the government, and the private sector all will have to play a role. Academia must educate the “New Transportation Professional;” state, local, and Federal governments must evolve to implement ITS methodology; and the private sector must also work to provide organizational readiness.

Funding is a difficulty with ITS. In the current climate, there are limits on funding of transportation. ITS will be competing for a finite amount of funding against more conventional projects, such as construction and maintenance.

Not to be ignored are the difficulties that stem from politics. “ITS’s advantages do not mesh with political realities.” The two principal advantages derived from ITS, intermodalism and regional scale, create problems in the political arena. Federal and state structures for transportation tend to be modal in organization, which make intermodalism a difficult goal. Local political structures are not usually organized by region, and consequently have difficulty working on a regional scale.

Despite the difficulties presented by ITS, we must move forward with a strategic vision. The strategic vision for ITS is as the integrator of transportation,

communications, and intermodalism on a regional scale. To achieve this vision, we must factor the current trend of growing emphasis on communities and regions into ITS deployment by looking at ITS as a regional initiative. Our best hope for long-term deployment is for communities to take the lead for improving strategic planning.

Yet, studies conducted by MIT indicate that we are a long way from achieving better Regional Strategic Transportation Plans. The study found that:

- Plans are still relatively unimodal.
- Strategic plans are dominated by public sector concerns and decision-making.
- Passenger-freight interaction is not there.
- There is a lack of partnership, including warring bureaucracies and fragmented governments in regions.
- The transportation-communication interface has not been effectively considered.
- Regional strategic planning does not have technology scan elements.
- Organizational readiness is a problem: Organizations need to change.
- Technical integration is not being factored into decision-making. Regions are not considering that they will have to develop their systems over long periods of time and will need to integrate technologies in the future.
- It is questionable whether the system architecture of ITS can be used to develop regional architectures to address integration problems. As the key to success for ITS, regional strategic transportation plans must become intermodal, utilize technology as a driver, employ system architecture to provide long-term interoperability, and integrate information/communication with transportation.

Addressing Externalities of System Performance

Hank Dittmar, STPP

Hank Dittmar is the Executive Director of the Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP). He presented information concerning design parameters for the 21st century.

Summary of Presentation

Design in the 21st century needs to incorporate notions of sustainability. The three principles of design for sustainability are conservation, regeneration, and stewardship. Conservation involves slowing the rate at which things are getting worse. Demand is currently increasing, and we cannot provide capacity concurrent with demand. Regeneration involves repairing and renewing our limited stock of capital. Stewardship

is characterized by frugal spending and wise investment. To achieve sustainability, we need to be aware of current trends, such as changes in manufacturing, use of the Internet, and changes in urban form.

Manufacturing and production have undergone significant change in the last few decades. Manufacturers have tremendously increased in number and have become decentralized. In addition, there is a movement toward home-based selling and just-in-time delivery to homes. These changes have major implications for transportation.

Telnet and Internet/WWW are creating change in many facets of our lives. Internet allows for accuracy of information to almost everyone. It is fostering a linked economy, which will require a faster, greater, and more intensive transportation system. As use of the Internet increases, multiple levels of government will need to deal with more transportation problems. For example, teleshopping and working at home may lead to breakdowns in system in-peak/off-peak periods.

Changes in urban form will also contribute to design challenges. Urban centers/downtowns will continue to be important but will not dominate the agenda. Instead, community-based regionalism will become more dominant. Transportation planning will need to refocus to account for regionalism. Given current trends, the initial formulation of ITS will prove inadequate for needs of the 21st century. The initial plan for a central structure between vehicle and infrastructure needs re-evaluation. The next version of ITS will need to be a technical ITS that can support an integrated, managed network. We need to move toward network transportation that facilitates one's preferred mode of transport. In conclusion, there are several examples of innovation that will move us into the 21st century. Regions and firms will innovate, and those working together will gain. The government has the capacity to facilitate changes needed, and hopefully we can move in that direction.

Private Sector View of Systems Management

John Cox, SCEP

John Cox is President of the Southern California Economic Partnership (SCEP). He presented a private sector view of ITS.

Summary of Presentation

ITS is the process of utilizing information and management to increase the effectiveness of an information system. Yet the role the public sector is playing in ITS is troubling. The public sector is encroaching on areas traditionally belonging to the private sector. The private sector, which understands the complexity of the multitude of issues, is quick to respond to market trends, and is in fact building ITS today.

Navigational devices are an example of the potential for disconnect between the public and private sectors. We expect that 30 percent of vehicles by the year 2000 will have navigators, but we are uncertain whether the public sector will be able to deliver meaningful information for these navigation devices.

Issues in the private sector include the impact of telecommunication, external/internal forces, and social equity/environmental constraints. Telecommunication will create significant changes: by the year 2005, 53 percent of households will have a computer, and there will be 23 million telecommuters. The private sector has focused on telecommunication, but the public sector needs to focus on how telecommunication impacts transportation systems. In a positive step in this direction, public sector agencies have begun to create Web pages, and the private sector is capitalizing on this use of public information.

The private sector is aware of external and internal forces upon it. We have an interest in the consumer's attitude and demands in convenience. We work toward systems that provide timeliness, safety of travel, and the ability to get to work conveniently. We recognize that information needs to be real time, affordable, easy to use, and low maintenance. We also realize that there are constraints of society, equity and the environment. We analyze whether the product delivered did the job it was supposed to do; this is a private sector attitude the public sector must adopt.

There are barriers to effective ITS that need to be addressed such as the concept of ITS as a public works program and the current status of limited core information structures, consumer markets, and funding. To overcome barriers, we need opportunities for new thinking and greater opportunities for toll revenues. The public sector needs to take advantage of private sector specialties and provide more funding to accommodate marketing/informing the public.

To make ITS work, we need to step outside the box. We must recognize the market-based nature of the system, the skills the private sector can provide, the need for innovative financing, the actions that have potential for environmental and transportation benefits, and the need to reduce regulatory costs.

Audience Comments for the Policy Session

The audience focused on several issues, including timing and progress. One participant was concerned about the length of time needed to put policy changes into practice. She asked the questions: Did ISTEA have any effect? How can the public sector think ahead and understand the proper challenges? Another participant responded that there has been five years of progress during which ISTEA has made a difference. He stated that we need to reinforce the move toward strategic planning and ask joint agencies to become accountable. Another participant disagreed that existing institutional structure will be better and advocated instead of a move into the free enterprise system. Some participants focused on technology. One discussed how

technology opens up new possibilities. Another recommended using the telecommunications model, which responds better to the market.

Others gave remarks concerning planning. One participant said that strategic planning should not be mandates. Planning needs to be focused on regions.

A participant noted the dichotomy between sustainability and privatization. He stated that the need to reduce costs and make a profit are inherent in a move toward privatization. Other goals, such as quality of life and air quality are not in the equation of privatization and could be overlooked.

Breakout Discussions

- Group 1 : Planning (Red)
- Group 2 : Information Systems (Green)
- Group 3 : Operations (Orange)
- Group 4 : Urban Form (Blue)

Participants gathered in four breakout groups to provide input on transportation issues in four areas: planning, information systems, operations, and urban form. Each group answered two general questions and then answered breakout-specific questions. The breakout-specific questions are listed underneath each breakout, and the general questions for all groups are listed below:

Question A:

Given the increased emphasis on operating and managing the existing surface transportation system more efficiently, as opposed to increasing systems capacity through major capital investments, what are the key factors to be considered?

- External and internal forces.
- Barriers.
- Opportunities

Question B:

With respect to transportation planning, programming, operations, and management for information-intensive transportation, what research gaps exist and what kinds of studies, research, and operational tests are most promising?

- Technical.
- Institutional.
- Financial.
- Organizational/staffing.

Breakout Group 1: Planning (Red)

Group 1 discussed planning issues. The session was moderated by Gary Ritter. Participants included the following: Carol Armstrong, Bob Benke, Wesley Blount, John Cox, John Duve, Gary Euler, David Ewing, Sheldon Edner, Bob Garbacz, Richard Hartman, William Hein, Linda Howe, Melissa Laube, Bruce McDowell, Andrew Meese, Jose-Luis Mesa, Juan Morales, Sigmund Silber, Joe Sussman, Stein Wissenberger, and David Zavattero.

The planning group answered the general questions A and B and also answered the following specific questions:

1. What changes in the planning and programming process are desirable to accommodate regional systems management, operations, and integrated information systems?
2. How should these changes be implemented? (administratively, legislatively, etc.).

Summary of Breakout Group 1 Discussions

Group 1 discussed the planning process, identified barriers and opportunities, and provided recommendations.

The group characterized the optimal planning process as one that is a multi-level, cascading process with private sector participation. To succeed, both planning *and* operations staff need to be involved in the planning process. Planning must include the concept of transportation as an interconnected system. Planners must include ITS in plan/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and coordinate ITI with other plans (communications). The planning process must be facilitated by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) that have vision, can generate benefits, and can foster cooperation.

Group 1 also identified planning barriers and opportunities. Barriers included a lack of clear ITS focus, competing jurisdictional interests, competition for limited funding, Federal funding issues, uncertain public intent, and a short planning horizon that focuses on TIP. Planning opportunities included private sector investment and the possibility of building on existing institutions and planning processes.

Group 1's recommendations for planning with ITS included the following: avoid regional authority; develop solutions not mandates; and set result-oriented goals. The group recommended using ITS as a change agent in the areas of regional architecture, deployment commitment, and operations integration.

Recorded Information from Breakout Group 1

Response to Question: Part A

- Changed emphasis to manage existing systems more efficiently over adding more capacity.

Key factors to consider:

- Need for a clearly focused mission statement, end goals, results/outcomes, vision; i.e., farmers out of mud.
- ITS as “software” to make the existing “hardware” work better.
- Need for different integrated process/documents. (In pencil: operations and plug).
- Outcome oriented, value-added management.
- Product potential of transportation information.
- Reluctance to transfer “hard” infrastructure money into ITS—still waiting for return of interstate funds.
- Allocation of tight funding resources among competing needs.
- Systems deployment tools needed to facilitate spread of implementation projects tied to goals or problems.
- Insufficient financial resources relative to needs.
- “Mandates” are menaces.
- Competing individual, political, and jurisdictional imperatives and their regional vs. individual economic implications.
- Intermodal interface barriers—how to use ITS to achieve “seamless” system.
- Institutional absorption capacities and limits; e.g., Woodrow Wilson Bridge, in which parts are the sum of the whole. Also mass vs. surface area—the growth dilemma.
- Parochial rather than regional view of transportation facilities and system.

Response to Question 1: Changes Needed

- Need for statewide coordination mechanisms, roles, and process.
- Crosscutting conceptual tools and vocabulary.
- ITS tools as a means of integrating information across functional levels.
- Collaborative ways to bring together operating and planning staffs.
- Better modeling tools to capture ITS impacts and benefits.
- Coordination of transportation system with other urban service systems.
- More diversified use of ITS information.

Response to Question 2: Implement Changes

- Conceptual national architecture.
- Mainstream ITS.
- Move beyond short-term maximizing.
- Better coordination of public and private investments - 20:80.
- ITS is a paradigm shift agent.

Wrap Up

- Public sector needs to set infrastructure investment parameters.
- More focused presentation of ITS benefits.

Breakout Group 2: Information Systems (Green)

Group 2 discussed information systems issues. The session was moderated by Tom Mottl and Katie Wyrosdick. Participants included the following: Beth Anne Bower, Stephan Heimburg, Paul Jovanis, John Mason, Mark R. Norman, Henry L. Peyrebrune, Christopher Pie, Robert C. Ricci, Kenneth Voorhies, Doug Wiesig, Kirk D. Fauver, Robert Franklin, Bruce Eisenhart, Brian Elliot, Carol Coleman, Tim McGuckin, C. Kenneth Orski, Daniel Jordan, Tom Horan, and Eva Lerner-Lam.

The Information Systems group answered general questions A and B and also answered the following specific questions:

1. What are the roles of various information systems in improving roadway and transit systems performance and the operations of various agencies?
 - ITS information systems such as operations and traveler information.
 - Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
 - National Information Infrastructure (NII).

2. In what ways can new technologies, systems concepts, and enterprises enable new levels of systems planning and management?
3. What specific issues (barriers, opportunities) need to be addressed before information technologies, systems, and enterprises can deliver maximum benefits?
4. What policy instruments are most appropriate: legislation, regulation, financial incentives, model arrangements, including relationship to new telecommunications law, etc.?

Summary of Breakout Group 2 Discussions

Key Factors:

- A system perspective.
- Identify tangible benefits and communicate them to all sectors.
- Build teams.
- Cross-function (exercise/experience).
- Cross-culture (public/public; public/private).

Gaps in Research, Studies, Operational Tests:

- Understand information impacts on travelers and resultant system impacts.
- Emphasize pilots and studies/local jurisdictions.
- “GIS” as platform.
- Attach assessment and evaluation funding to pilot contracts.
- Enable communication and create a team.

Recorded Information from Breakout Group 2

Response to Question A1: External and Internal Forces

- Operating agencies think of projects not systems, serving customers. They need to better define users.
- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)—political process problem, i.e., what the user sees—example: potholes, road widening vs. signal retiming. Need tangible benefits for politicians.
- Benefits are not very tangible.
- Need to do evaluations to properly identify the BENEFITS and the REWARDS.

Response to Question 2: Opportunities

- Communication—of the benefits of public investment.
- External—maintenance and operations vs. capitol expenses.
- Training of staff at state level is typically civil.
- State representatives are not equipped to sell their own products in ITS.
- Internet implications? Gets word out—new technologies are making it easier. Questions: what's free, competing with free, i.e., radio, information.
- Need to know how travelers use information, i.e., transit decision, mode switches, etc.
- Unknowns: What product will the consumer pay for? (personalized vs. general). What is the market? Who is the customer? Not necessarily the traveling public (could be telecommunications company).
- Data sharing, public/private partnership, etc.
- Maintenance—into ITS—automated.

Response to Question C: NII and ITS

- ITS has not defined the standard requirements.
- Telecommunications.
- Software and systems integration.
- NII—not being addressed.
- Local people feel NII is pushing down on ITS from the ground up.
- Bringing both together, missing knowledge of both. Developing learning curve on how they fit together.

- Complicated and high level—NII

Response to Question C1:

- State agencies do not recommend alternative routes (liability).
- Technology push vs. customer pull.
- Need new business models.
- Transit does not have the same liability issues as the alternatives route recommendations.
- Metro networks business model using advertisement as customer.
- Areas that have big public investment could be using private funding.
- CVO—Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS) for trucks. Did surveys—economic component of CVO a lot willing to pay for customized traveler information.
- GIS—lifeblood of MPO, operators and planners on same map!

Response to Systems Planning and Operations:

- Maintenance—dynamic data base, proactive.
- MPO—find a way to tailor information for their use. Buy-in, cooperation. Ex. O-D study.
- Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) for ATM's and APTS—\$\$
- Information rarely being used for planning.
- State codes—resource sharing, public data.
- Systems engineer!

Response to Question 4: Legislation—ITE, AASHTO, Professional Society (Resource Sharing):

- Financial incentives.
- Cannot ignore local needs and goals—cannot force ITS. A buy-in is needed.
- Political implications—WANT BENEFITS.
- Local governments—Mainstreaming! ITS procurement, design build, legislation.

Response to Question B. Research Gaps:

Left side:

- How travelers respond to ATIS.
- Can ITS be used to manage demand and the effect on system performance?
- MOEs
- Put some money into planning.
- Need to build the tools for local jurisdictions, e.g., GIS.
- GIS—MPOs, etc.
- Measure operational test impact over a longer term—5-10 years.

Right side:

Most promising of these:

- Use separate funding for evaluation. That is not necessarily attached to a project.
- MOEs.
- Put some money into planning.

Breakout Group 3: Operations (Orange)

Group 3 discussed operations issues. The session was moderated by Dennis Foderberg. Participants included the following: Farid Bigdeli, Gerard Cioffi, Paul Cuerton, Ginger Gherardi, Les Jacobson, David Judd, Stephanie Kolb, Walter Kraft, Steve Lockwood, William Mahorney, John Merritt, Graham Norton, Jon Obenberger, John Olson, James Robinson, Robert Stout, Peggy Tadej, KT Thirumalai, and Edward Thomas.

The Operations group answered general questions A and B and also answered the following specific questions:

1. What institutional and organizational barriers exist that prevent the inclusion of operations in the planning and programming process?
2. What is required in terms of activities, roles, relations, organization, staffing—public and private, etc.—to deploy and manage/operate an information-intensive system which improves operation of the roadway and transit service?

Summary of Breakout Group 3 Discussions

Group 3 first addressed the increased emphasis on operations and management. They noted that the goal is not either ITS system efficiency or additional capacity, but rather a rational balance between both. The forces that are most impacting operations include the debate between economic development and no-growth opposition groups, existing congestion, using ITS as an opportunity to deal with both current and future congestion, and viewing ITS as a set of operational technologies.

The group addressed several barriers to effective operations. One barrier is that currently mechanisms for effective coordination are not in place. Another barrier is that more education of the public is needed—people do not know what ITS is. A lack of focus on defining the problem is also a barrier. Yet another barrier is that there is a need to develop a shared vision of what we are trying to accomplish. The group identified several institutional barriers which include political boundaries, a lack of consensus on a definition of ITS, lack of flexibility, education, and research sharing.

Recorded Information from Breakout Group 3

Response to Question A:

- Capacity NOT a system option, INCORRECT.
- Barriers:
 - Coordination and cooperation system among agencies in place, prior to plan being complete and successful.
 - When and how to involve “other” non-key agency stakeholders.
 - Participation of all stakeholders.
 - Create non-biased environment and/or process.
- Do we know or understand PROBLEM vs. HOW TO APPLY TECHNOLOGY AS A SOLUTION?
- Educate first, then get solutions (B2).
- Incident management focus. For coordination between agency coordination and the result. Cause to meet and start process (catalyst).
- Right people need to meet and work on a particular issue, even within an agency. To schedule a meeting is time-consuming by itself.
- Top-down commitment (champion identified). This was debated. Many felt that top-down does not work, and that support at all levels is necessary to move forward.

Response to Questions A and B:

- Opportunities to get groups together for everyone’s interest. A “group” vs. individual interest.
- Technical level cooperation and champions needed IN ADDITION to top level buy-in.
- Capital investment is not an option, but is required.
- Integration and communication with ITS requires special groups with specific part of a project.

Response to Question B:

- Synthesis of lessons learned from other technology applications. Case studies from other industries.
- Examples to public officials needed for benefits of ITS to build support, use success stories.
- Standards and research need to incorporate and build on communication and information systems applications for transportation.
- Be flexible to respond with issue and how to accomplish a task to get most influence of issue or product.

Response to Question B: Research

- Research component to advance technology.
- Information clearinghouse to get technologies to public with ways to solve current needs.
- Public research being done, which private sector may not be involved with at all.
- Agencies required to train their own staff, which costs money.
- Compatible systems in place for maintenance to be performed on systems.
 1. Core infrastructure identified at state and local level for public sector investment/needs.
 2. How private sector can use public infrastructure output to add value/package and distribution to users and consumers.

Response to Question 1: Barriers

- Barriers are local. Tools are in place to solve but organizations are not reacting to address the barriers.
- MPOs make up mission. Are barriers capital only?
- Large MPOs
- Public need for information from operating groups who are not able to distribute to users.

Institutional:

- Transit groups left out of process
- Public access to public data.
- Bridge public dialogue to support for systems.

Legislation:

- Requirements support capital investments to utilize existing Federal funding available.
- ITS improvements do not fit within current Federal guidelines. Non-traditional funding used for ITS.
- Global solutions cannot fit all needs. Local constraints influence.
- Cannot compete now with funding for ITS unless legislation changes. Now incremental build-out required.
- Innovative ways for providing systems through operations and maintenance.
- Operation and management functions need to be addressed in planning processes.
- Smaller urban areas need dedicated funding for ITS to continue.
- ITS needs to work with others in MPO process to educate, receive buy-in, and then compete where funding exists.
- What ultimate systems will look like depends on changing of legislation for operations planning.

Response to Question 2:

- What is meant by INFORMATION-INTENSIVE systems related to ITS and other systems. (Repeating barrier to address real issue or problem?)
- Educate to show examples for how ITS will work and be effective, benefits and in public interest to facilitate this education effort for elected leaders and professionals.
- Coordination and collaboration required due to number of agencies, and takes a lot of time.
- Transition for technology for staff to operate, use and understand through Federal support, training, etc.
- Resource sharing as a leverage to public sector investment commitment.

Ability to Understand Impacts:

Forces:

- Economic development trends vs. other options (no growth).
- Future with ability to maintain and provide services (growth).
- Opportunities outside of traditional transportation projects or options.
- Quality of environment vs. just doing project for congestion.
- Solutions to problems require involvement with ITS projects from other portions of agencies, re: telecommunications groups.
- “Move” to private sector with value added to public sector. Generated, processed, distributed information currently working with both public and private.
- Education of agencies’ staff to support systems is a barrier to plan, implement, operate, etc.—(opportunity) temporal issue.

Breakout Group 4: Urban Form (Blue)

Group 4 discussed urban form issues. The session was moderated by Lee Munnich of the University of Minnesota. John Gerner of FHWA served as the recorder. Participants included the following: Don Chen, Robert Dunphy, Emil Frankel, Robert Hicks, Rich Kuzmyak, Janet Oakley, Gene Ofstead, Edith Page, Tom Horan, and Wayne Berman.

The Urban Form group answered the general questions A and B and also answered the following specific questions:

1. What trends in urban form, land use, and environmental quality are pertinent to providing information-based transportation?

2. How can information be used to help reduce transportation environmental externalities?
3. What are the market, institutional, and political implications?

Summary of Breakout Group 4 Discussions

Group 4 identified key factors in urban form. One of the key factors was the gap between planning and operations. Another was that new thinking and skills are needed to implement operations and maintenance. Along with this factor comes the idea that we do not yet have the emphasis on operations and maintenance that we need. Also a factor is the limited resources, which will force the need to improve system efficiencies. Finally, a key factor is how we are going to manage chaotic systems: possibilities include tinkering, having a shared vision, and promoting strategic directions.

The group found that current trends in urban form stem from urban sprawl. Our love affair with suburbs is resulting in financial constraints and crumbling infrastructure. Our quality of life will be affected. Other trends in urban form deal with social equity. We need to decide how to incorporate welfare-to-work, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and other social equity topics into our transportation systems.

The group adopted the slogan “Bending the Curve” as an expression of its solution to current urban form issues. Bending the curve, the group noted, is essentially rethinking old ways of solving problems and developing innovative approaches. One participant offered the Minnesota DOT Pricing Policy as an innovative example of bending the curve. Innovative deployment decisions will need to take marketing and individual decisions into account. An example of this was given: if people could have a *predictable* commuting time, they would probably be willing to pay for that benefit. Innovative approaches are needed for information dissemination. We need to get the message out about benefits of ITS. Another example of bending the curve is thinking in a modally blind way; that is, thinking of transportation as a whole, rather than as components of transit, highway, etc. We need to focus on the desired outcomes—mobility and accessibility. We also need to work on using bench marking as a tool to improve our systems. Bending the curve also means developing a successful transportation/communications link.

Recorded Information from Breakout Group 4

Part 1. Operations and Maintenance Considerations in Planning

- Not an either/or situation. Need capacity and more efficiency.
- Operations. High-Tech is not currently on planning horizon—needs more emphasis.
- Certain operational strategies are known (fare cards, ramp metering).
- Operations. Information systems—need more and better data to consider alternatives.
- Operations. Limited resources force need to improve system efficiency.

Operations and Maintenance will require new thinking and skills to implement.

- Need to show benefits to win funding.
- ITS needs a plan to be effective.
- ITS can improve access to jobs and benefits.
- Concern with long-term results of ITS, e.g., world of speed.
- Freight is a big area for study.
- High capital/short lifecycle.
- Does it shrink or expand the future urban area?
- Question that there is an increase in emphasis on operations and maintenance.
- Transportation is low in priority in housing decisions.
- Need more research into how transportation influences land use decisions.
- Need research into actual tripmaking in the telecommute, 4-day work week situation.
- Operations and maintenance needed to complete comprehensive view of transportation costs and benefit decisions.
- Strategic decision-making is key to maximizing impact.
- Private sector needs to be more active in decision-making and funding.

Response to Question—Research Needs

- Mobility impacts of operations and maintenance improvements.
- Improvements in predictability of transportation services.

- Need deployments to prove results.
- Better information on what type of transportation service people need.
- Impact of information systems (e.g., Internet, telecommunications) on travel demand.
- Outcome focused deployment—not modal deployment.
- Framework to quantify system impacts of improvements.
- What are the “right” things to measure—(e.g. throughput, travel time, v/c).

Response to Question—Trends that Impact Land Use

- Information technologies support suburbanization.
- Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) is fastest growing segment of transportation.
- Information can impact decision on route and timing of trip.
- Americans will not accept broad-based pricing options.
- Continued demand—will increase.
- Maintenance needs will increase.
- ITS needed to implement congestion pricing.
- ITS can be used in generating new revenue.
- ITS has an impact on the supply of transportation and also influences individual decisions.
- Fiscally constrained transportation plan is most influential in shaping long-range plans.
- Is there a minimum “free” level of information to be given to all?
- Social equity should NOT be a barrier to pricing.
- Need to have a diverse set of outcome scenarios upon which to base decisions.
- Local performance measures key to shaping local responses.

Closing Comments for Day One

Wayne Berman

Wayne Berman gave summary remarks concerning the day’s discussion of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). He noted that participants had a keen interest in MPOs and operations. He recognized that participants thought that too

much control to the MPOs might take away the ability of operators to carry out their programs. Mr. Berman stated that the questions being addressed in this symposium included:

- What is the role of the MPO in a new era of information-intensive transportation?
- How do we speed up deployment through traditional processes?
- How do we communicate standards through an MPO process?

Robert Stout

Robert Stout is the Director of Planning and Operations, Federal Transit Administration.

Bob Stout was pleased with day one's discussion of education, coordination, and roles of the MPO. He remarked that his organization is currently working on major investment studies, in which ITS is something to be observed. Regarding research of ITS, he commented that the lack of evaluation tools is a concern. He hoped to see some work done on this issue during day two.

Sheldon Edner

Sheldon Edner is a Community Planner with the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Sheldon Edner summarized that it is apparent from the day's discussions that there are lots of inherent contradictions in transportation. He noted that we want to strengthen the planning process, and at the same time address how to deal with the Nation's 339 MPOs. He expressed the need for cross-cultural communications. He concluded, "We need to address where we go in the future."

Proceedings for Day Two

State and Local Challenges to Linking Planning, Operations, Systems Management and Traveler Information

George Schoene, Moderator

George Schoene is Team Coordinator for the U.S. DOT Federal Highway Administration, Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications. He served as moderator for the panel discussion. After providing a welcome and introductions, Mr. Schoene stated that, "One of the challenges is how do we get operators to be knowledgeable about the planning process? And another is: How do we get planners to appreciate the problems that we have to deal with as operators?" He said that panelists will discuss these issues.

John Duve, (SANDAG)

John Duve is with the San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) Advanced Transportation Group. He presented information on ITS planning issues.

Summary of Presentation

Southern California has developed its infrastructure and has completed regional plans. The regional plans have given us the opportunity to see exactly what is needed and how systems fit together. Through regional planning, we have seen that the fundamental component of ITS is integration. Integration highlights the fact that "we can not stand alone;" that is, regional plans need a fundamental "spine" to be operable. That spine is part of the National Highway System. The Federal government needs to play a strong leadership role and function as the spine for state and regional programs.

Along with strong leadership, the Federal government needs to develop a national deployment program. We need a national consensus on which systems to deploy. The national plan would be drawn from state/regulatory department plans. There should be a sense of some basic systems that are desirable across the Nation that we could implement. We can select initial systems and get going on implementation. The Federal government could develop a plan to deploy the chosen system; this would allow states to have something to build and focus on. We've done enough work that deployment is essential at this point. ISTEA has been primarily for research and testing, but now we need to apply that research to deploying a particular system. By deploying a system, we will bring the private sector in to contribute to the process and create a national market. The Federal government needs to find something to deploy and begin that process.

To coincide with the National Deployment Program, we also need a State Deployment program that is developed in an open forum in which stakeholders can participate fully. The state plan should be drawn from regional plans, which are fundamental to the ITS planning and deployment process.

Focus should be on the Regional Deployment Plan. There is no consensus concerning who controls the plan's development: some think MPO forums are better and others believe DOT should lead. Wherever everyone is engaged in the planning process is the best place for that process. That could be in the MPO forum or at DOT. The debate of MPOs vs. DOT is not the important issue; rather, the issue is, "What is the path to deployment?"

Going back to the Federal level, another important issue is Federal funding. The Federal straw man that is included in the symposium packets is supportive of things that regions wish to do. ISTEA provides \$200 million for research and testing, and has focused on those issues. We would support an Integrated Deployment Incentive, which is currently given \$200 million, but the Federal funding is not sufficient to support the kind of programs we need just in the San Diego area. The Integrated Deployment Incentive should allow priority corridors to deploy nationally significant systems that would function as prototypes. One of the most essential things that needs to come out of NEXTEA is deployment—a way to fund programs and plans. Planning is of no value without funding. There is no funding mechanism for deployment at present. Many of us have spent the time to clearly decide what we want to build and we need this next step. The Federal government needs to provide a mechanism for funding.

The potential of ITS/ITI is clearly through integration. Nationally, we need a consensus plan to integrate systems. Regionally, we need the ability to show benefit to the public, which will not be possible if systems are not on line from region to region. A plan for integration is not a mandate; rather it is Federal leadership.

Les Jacobson, Washington Department of Transportation

Les Jacobson is the Traffic Services Manager of the Washington Department of Transportation. He presented information linking planning and operations.

Summary of Presentation

Linking planning and operations is accomplished only by overcoming many challenges. One challenge is to view ITS as a transportation element, not a separate program. If it is viewed as separate, it is less likely to be utilized. Another challenge involves collaboration. All applicable organizations must have defined roles in a collaboration process, and we need to find innovative and appropriate approaches to collaboration. Collaboration is not information dissemination; rather, it should be a process of passing on information *while* communicating with various groups and organizations. Yet another challenge is the ability to develop Regional (national) systems that preserve local determination. There is a concern about the dichotomy between total local determination and systems models: obviously there needs to be a balance. Finally, there is the challenge of knowing the performance of systems. This can be accomplished by ensuring that performance monitoring programs are in place and are carried out.

While linking planning and operations, we must also maintain a flexibility of approach. The flexibility will allow for local/regional uniqueness, the ability to lead/respond to trends, and the opportunities to migrate to mature models. Through flexibility and linkage of the ITS Plan with state and Regional policy, a Systems Plan, a Regional Vision, and an MPO, we can bring ITS into the mainstream.

Ginger Gherardi, Ventura County Transportation Commission

Ginger Gherardi is the Executive Director of the Ventura County Transportation Commission. She presented an alternative view of planning and implementation.

Summary of Presentation

I would like to present my view of planning, implementation, and transit issues. Some comments may strike you as heresy. Despite our alternative approach, we have been successful in implementing three key projects.

There are several key planning principles. The first is that there is no such thing as an “ultimate system.” That means that we need to keep in mind that what we do today is disposable, is short-term. In planning we must provide for future technology by incorporating the *concept only* into long-range transportation plans. Another planning principle is that ITSs are “lifestyle tools,” i.e., ways of thinking, acting, managing and operating. How one approaches implementation will determine the amount of success. The following are suggestions for implementation:

- Learn how to communicate in plain English!
- Never, never use words like: ITS, ITI, System architecture, protocols, etc.

- Always use words like: new, better, high-tech, cutting edge—stir imagination, market concepts.
- Do not try to be too global! Have a clear vision.
- Be open to opportunities. You can not have all the answers.
- Do not be afraid to try something new—consider it a work in progress.
- Implement small visible projects with clear public benefit that are easy to implement.
- Remember that success and support are measured by the *public* in perceived personal benefit and convenience.

Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) has three successfully implemented projects and two more in the planning stages. We established on-line transit routing that includes all of Southern California except San Diego. The cost of the project was \$60,000, and we implemented it in three months. We developed a County-wide Passport, also known as a Smart Card. Used on 70 buses and 10 systems, the card features convenience for the public and is viewed as a debit card. The cost was funded through Volpe/CALTRANS and \$150,000 of local money. The Card was implemented in just over two years. The third project was the installment of TTY call boxes for hearing-impaired drivers. The call boxes were designed and manufactured by the private sector. We used a competitive bidding process and received cost proposal of \$0.00. We took the low bid of \$0.00. The call boxes are now being installed at no cost to us. Transit involves different issues for developing ITS. For example, transit operation costs are not treated the same way as highway operation costs. We need to modify or clarify the funding structure to permit operational and maintenance costs of ITS systems. We also need to measure long-term planning benefits and savings. We must develop an operational test to cross the modes of rail/bus/park.

In conclusion, “The public in our county recognizes the value of ITS because we’re doing it.”

Gene Ofstead, Minnesota Department of Transportation

Gene Ofstead is the Assistant Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Transportation. He presented materials concerning planning and operations.

Summary of Presentation

For planning and operations to work well together, we need “outside the box” thinking. We must first recognize that we use planning for more than it was designed to do. Operations people put plans in bottom drawers. The big attraction of ITS is that it may be used as the steering mechanism of the ship, that is, as the guiding force.

The transition to effective ITS planning and operations can be viewed in the following four stages of development:

1. Beginning.

2. Maintaining/Growing/Accelerating.
3. Taking the Discontinuous Step (Breakthrough).
4. Moving to Level 2 Technology.

Our current struggle involves transitioning from stage 2, Maintaining/Growing/Accelerating, to stage 3, Taking the Discontinuous Step (Breakthrough). Stage 2 is characterized by maintaining momentum and resources, expanding participation, and keeping a high profile. The transition to stage 3 will involve reorganizing our institutions to get the right people in position and thereby gain acceptance from established organizations. The transition will necessitate fostering trust for new alliances and achieving public acceptance of new ways. It will also require transportation professionals to estimate the growth of product markets.

Stage 3 is the “Discontinuous Step.” During stage 3, transportation partners will have to maintain a strong commitment to mutual goals, focus on outcomes, share control, and develop a synergy based on trust. Organizations will have to reorient themselves to implement new thinking (i.e., “put new wine in the wine skins.”) Stage 3 could be a stage characterized by unconventional taxing methods, which might include product sales as a capital source.

To move to stage 3 we must recognize and overcome the reality of our current situation, which includes several challenging issues. We are far from having the partnerships of stage 3, but rather are still stuck in the national culture “thing” (or generic way of life). We lack “structures” to deal with large issues. There are still major private sector issues that are similar to government issues, such as transit vs. freight. The government gap between operations and strategic initiatives is large, which is evident in Transportation Research Board Special Report #249: *“Momentum for Change: Creating a Strategic Forum for Innovation in Highway Infrastructure.”* The time gap for government process vs. private process is a big problem. And finally, planning may not be the issue or the solution.

Despite the challenges, there are steps we can take to move forward. We can begin by looking at what *is* working, i.e., other models. We can attempt to close the time gap by concentrating on moving from vision to strategy to business plans and by letting the quickest lead. We can pick targets along market driven lines. We shouldn’t get mired down in problems, but rather should keep “doing stuff,” use chaos as an opportunity, and support bellwether efforts. We need to continue to see ITS as a lever for major institutional change.

Panel Discussion of Policy and Reauthorization Implications

Moderator, Steve Lockwood, PB Farradyne, Inc.

Steve Lockwood of PB Farradyne, Inc., served as the moderator of this session, which focused on the reauthorization of the ISTEA legislation.

Cindy Burbank

Cindy Burbank, Chief, Legislative and Strategic Planning Division, the Federal Highway Administration. The topic of her presentation was the Reauthorization of ISTEA.

Summary of Presentation

We are undergoing a shift in planning from developing lists of capital investments to establishing a system of operations. In ISTEA, planning is one of the biggest and most important areas. We want to strengthen the planning process in reauthorization and bring in a broader perspective.

The Department of Transportation was determined to set a broader framework for reauthorization. The Department approach involved extensive outreach to determine what is not right about ISTEA. We heard from participants that ISTEA is basically right, but needs fine-tuning. We used that information in developing legislative language, which we are scheduled to take to Congress in February.

We focused on the questions that will need to be answered with NEXTEA. The only questions in reauthorization of ISTEA are how much money, who gets it, and what can you use it for. The question of how much money is still being debated. It's important to remember that we are working within a "balance the budget" climate, so it will be tough to see an increase. Concerning the question of who gets the money: the donor-donee debate will eclipse everything else. And finally is the question of what can you use it for. The DOT position on usage is still in draft form, but some tendencies include:

- Broaden eligibilities.
- Continue major programs.
- Continue environmental programs.
- Place more emphasis on operations and maintenance and ITS tools.
- Retain planning process and expand to broader priority process.
- Develop methods of providing incentives for ITS deployment.
- Strengthen technology transfer and research.

The bill DOT is submitting will provide greater opportunity for ITS. It will provide a framework for greater management of ITS and promote ITS deployment. While it will promote these ideas, it is unlikely that new mandates will be added.

William F. Hein, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

William F. Hein is the Deputy Executive Director of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Oakland, California. He discussed the need for stasis at this point in the movement toward ITS.

Summary of Presentation

A major change came with ISTEA, and now it is time for a period of stasis. We need to focus on capacity building and partnerships. For capacity building, we need to streamline procurement, train professionals in technology and ITS, provide funding for operations, and conduct research and development. We need to develop horizontal partnerships that provide a regional focus, encompass intermodal issues, assist with funding flexibility, and seek to mainstream ITS. During this period of stasis, ITS becomes the enabling technology to allow partnerships to work.

Using the above model, there are policy implications for NEXTEA. One is that currently, dollars still lead planning, and this needs to change. We must also beware of backsliding into the National Highway System, which would be disastrous. We need to focus on mainstreaming ITS; to accomplish that goal, there should be no categorical funding for ITS, because it should be part of everyday processes.

In conclusion, ITS is good government. “Even Adam Smith assumed there would be some government to moderate the excesses of the free market.”

Hal Kassoff, ITS America

Hal Kassoff is the Chief Operating Officer of ITS America. He discussed his organization's view of reauthorization issues and the role of MPOs in the future.

Summary of Presentation

ISTEA was a landmark effort to launch integrated systems. We have conducted research and the technology, which has been demonstrated. The technology does work and it is not the issue; rather, the issue is going about ITS in a systematic way. We now need a deployment system of some kind. To accomplish deployment, we need to build a public sector foundation into one for the private sector.

The Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have a critical role to play. The concern is that MPOs may remain aloof, because ITS is not in their comfort zone. The MPO's role is one of education and encouragement. MPOs cannot compel ITS to happen. MPOs will need to provide service in a non-regulatory framework. The role of MPOs should be a case by case approach. "Those MPOs who approach ITS with appreciation for its complexity and recognize the power of their role as regional leaders/facilitators will help ITS to unfold."

From ITS America's point-of-view, reauthorization is a chance to shift gears to full deployment mode. Some of the questions that need to be answered to reach deployment through reauthorization include: Where between mandate and evolution is the role? Do we need to jump start ITS? If the Federal government does not have the funding for a leadership role, will these things happen?

ITS America has eight principles for the Direction of ITS Reauthorization. These include the following:

1. Supporting the national goal to deploy basic ITS services by 2005 with the provision that 5 percent of the program be invested in ITS unless local officials want to modify.

This establishes a central tendency for ITS to come together on a national level. It answers the question: "Will we have a chain or a collection of links?"

2. Continuing support for ITS research.
3. Making funding for ITS more stable and predictable.
4. Encouraging innovative financing and public/private partnerships.
5. Removing barriers to public/private partnerships.
6. Broadening definition of ITS to allow for training, operations and maintaining of ITS technology in addition to ITS capital expenditures.
7. Developing consensus-based standards.

8. Requiring annual reports to Congress.

In conclusion, “If we think of the ITS lifecycle, ISTEA 2 is a once-in-a-life-cycle chance to grow in a more vibrant way.”

Federal Commentator: Jeff Lindley, ITS Joint Program Office

Jeff Lindley is the Deputy Director, ITS Joint Program Office, U.S. Department of Transportation.

Summary of Comments

The Department of Transportation’s outreach process for the reauthorization of ITS produced two messages: 1) Continue the ITS program—do not mainstream. Provide a Federal role of leadership as well as consensus-building, training, and research and development role, and 2) The slow process of refocusing on deployment was appropriate. Now we need to go further.

The NEXTEA ITS Program is moving toward deployment incentives and provisions. Under consideration are the following initiatives: deployment incentive funding, full Federal aid eligibility for ITI user services (including operations and management costs), required compatibility with national ITS Architecture and applicable national standards, emphasis of ITS within the transportation planning process, public/private partnering, and innovative financing and procurement methods. Although the reauthorization will continue research and development, it will also help get started with deployment and try to remove barriers to Federal aid programs.

As someone involved in the reauthorization process, I offer the following reflections.

- Lots of compromises are being forged and there will be even more compromises ahead.
- The effect of the balanced budget climate is to put pressure against new programs and against flexibility.
- The Department is supporting the vision of deployment *now*.
- Regarding the 5 percent goal mentioned by Hal Kassoff, there is no consensus on this. There is only mixed support for it, and it is not in the Department’s proposal for reauthorization.

The opportunity for deployment will not exist in the same way in five years, so it’s a critical time. We need to use this opportunity to facilitate as much effective deployment of ITS as possible over the next five years, and we will work real hard to do that.

Federal Commentator: Robert Stout

Robert Stout is with the Federal Transit Administration. His comments focused on transit issues for the FTA.

Summary of Comments

MPOs and planning have been a focus of discussion. We are currently looking at redesignation of MPOs. The current proposal requires a reaffirmation process in which 75 percent of the members of an MPO must agree to relook at membership. FTA is looking at lowering this threshold. MPOs also need to address issues of inadequate public participation and frequency of meetings.

In the planning process, we are trying to get MPOs more flexibility. We hope MPOs will include ITS as an issue to be considered as part of the planning process. Regarding the proposal of a 5 percent set aside mentioned by Hal Kassoff, this is a good approach, but it may need to be incremented, such as 2 percent in year one, leading up to 5 percent in year six.

Federal Commentator: Wayne Berman

Wayne Berman is with FHWA. He presented key points from the symposium.

Summary of Comments

The symposium focused on many issues. I would like to highlight the following three key points:

1. In regional operations planning, the MPO clearly has a role of creating a vision for the future.
2. When seeking to integrate systems, plan smart and buy smart; ask questions about how capital investments can be linked in the future; and establish a regional integrator of systems.
3. An MPO can achieve institutional partnerships.

Open Floor for Comments and Suggestions

One of the main topics of discussion during the open floor session was the 5 percent issue proposed by ITS America's Hal Kassoff. Some felt that specific percentages for ITS should be avoided and that limits should not be put on ITS, or else it will get boxed in and MPOs will not have the flexibility they need. Another praised the 5 percent proposal as an inertia-defeating mechanism and stated that it levels the playing field so that advanced technologies have a possibility of being chosen by local decision makers. Yet another dismissed the 5 percent proposal because he regarded the proposal as creating ITS as a thing, which it is not.

The proposal of reconstitution of MPOs met with opposition from several audience members. One participant stated that it could be disastrous for the Federal government to get involved in such matters: it could lead to chaos and set up a

condition for grants that would move us away from mainstreaming ITS. Another participant agreed with this assessment.

The need for funding was a topic of discussion during the open forum. One participant pointed out that priority corridors have raised the public's expectations, yet new systems are costly to implement. He stated that funding is needed to address this, and that if appropriations fall short, we have created hollow promises. He noted that states may be committing to future costs that will not be covered by Federal programs. His solution was to target funds where traffic is the worst. Several other participants voiced the need for increased funding to implement ITS. One noted that the future costs that will not be covered by Federal programs may lead to innovative ways of paying for ITS that lead to public/private partnerships. Another noted that some people have been left out of funding allocations and that the Federal programs need to be expanded to include those who have been left out.

Operations, maintenance, and management were also discussed. A participant noted that one often hears the abbreviation O&M, but that the M may stand for maintenance or management. He proposed that we should think of the M as management, because it has more importance than maintenance, which is really a side issue. He asked the group: "Do we really need to rethink operations? Is it really totally different?" He concluded by saying that operations is simply anything that keeps the system functioning. Another participant noted an increase in interest in operational issues. He noted that his MPO has not had a single discussion of ITS, and that he is nervous about strengthening the role of MPOs because they tend to focus on the capital side of operations rather than the operating side. A third person countered that there should not be a disconnect between how you operate and how you build: transportation needs to be thought of as a whole system. MPOs need to manage a system and serve as a facilitator.

Other participants had comments concerning ISTEA and NEXTEA. One stated that NEXTEA needs to include provisions for deployment. Another characterized ISTEA 1 as a shift that charted a plan toward the 1970's and 1980's needs; that is, ISTEA is a Federal-aid program that put everything into place just as we reached the point that we do not need that anymore. He stated that now we are shackled with this legislation. Another participant saw a disconnect between ISTEA 1 and 2; specifically, if ITS allows for everything you may want to do, it becomes a local and cultural issue with different demographic groups wanting different things. This participant felt that ISTEA was terrific legislation, but that to implement it, we cannot think in compartmentalized ways.

Public participation and consensus-building was also mentioned. One participant was strongly encouraging participation of the public: she stated that we have to have both public participation and consensus-building. She stated that we should not compromise participation while we are trying to streamline administrative processes. Another participant agreed, and stated that to make effective decisions, we need to be more responsive. He wondered whether there is any way for reauthorization to increase responsiveness and at the same time shorten the approval process.

Regarding planning, one participant noted that communication is needed. He stated that planners must cultivate a system perspective. He also noted the central role of telecommunications for ITS planning. He stated that linked telecommunications/transportation policy should be looked at carefully.

Future Directions: Tom Horan

Tom Horan provided a synopsis of the symposium.

Summary of Presentation

During the symposium, participants and presenters discussed some of the most challenging transportation issues ahead. From their comments, we can identify several macro trends:

- A transition from the interstate to the post-interstate era.
- An overall devolution of government.
- Fiscal constraints.
- Heightened public expectations.
- Rapidly advancing telecommunications.

There was considerable debate of many issues. Points of general agreement include the existence of a gulf between operations and planning, and the potential of systems integration management as a way to bridge that gulf. Points of contention included the degree of faith in the private sector, the need for a reassertion of the public role, and uncertainty concerning which mechanisms are legitimate. The symposium illustrated the strategic challenges faced by transportation. One challenge is the reestablishment of public confidence in quality transportation services. There is a disconnect regarding how to get to that point. We need to rethink how to engage the public and to develop a new platform for dialogue and agreement. Another strategic challenge is defining the roles of institutions. Not only do institutions need to redefine roles, but they also need to reinvent themselves. Linking is yet another strategic challenge. We need to develop how customer service and information technology can form components of a program. For example, FedEx is a linking of transportation and information; it can be seen as a metaphor for an institution's re-linking with a customer.

Concluding Remarks

Wayne Berman

Wayne Berman reminded participants that today is a historic day: it's the anniversary of Kitty Hawk. He urged participants to build on the crescendo created at this conference and address the tension between where we are and where we need to go.

ATTENDEE LIST

Carol Armstrong

National Association of Regional Councils
Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
1700 K Street, NW, Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20006
phone: (202) 457-0710
fax: (202) 296-9352

Aladdin Barkawi

Highway Research Engineer
USDOT/FHWA
6300 Georgetown Pike
McLean, Virginia 22101
phone: (703) 285-2093
fax: (703) 285-2264
e-mail: aladdin.barkawi@fhwa.dot.gov

Robert J. Benke

Director, Office of Research Administration
Minnesota Department of Transportation
MS 330
395 John Ireland Boulevard
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
phone: (612) 282-2267
fax: (612) 296-6599
e-mail: rj.benke@dot.state.mn.us

Wayne Berman

Transportation Specialist
FHWA
HTV-3 RM 3408
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-4069
fax: (202) 266-8712

Farid Bigdeli

Transportation Planning Program Manager
Virginia DOT/No. VA District
3975 Fair Ridge Drive, Suite 200
Fairfax, Virginia 22033
phone: (703) 383-2218
fax: (703) 383-2230

Wesley Blount

Traffic Management/FHWA Trainee
FHWA
10 S. Howard Street, Suite 4000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
phone: (410) 962-0091
fax: (410) 962-4586
e-mail: fh03rg.wblount@intergate.dot.gov

Beth Anne Bower

Business Development Manager
Smart Route Systems
141 Portland Street, Suite 7000
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
phone: (617) 494-8100 x143
fax: (617) 494-8186
e-mail: bbower@smartroute.com

Ron Boenau

Senior Program Manager
Federal Transit Administration
(TRI-II)
400 Seventh Street, SW

Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-0195
fax: (202) 366-3765
e-mail: ron.boenau@fta.dot.gov

Beverly C. Cenname

Special Assistant to Deputy General Manager
WMATA
600 5th Street, NW, Suite 205
Washington, DC 20005
phone: (202) 962-1554
fax: (202) 962-6329

Donald T. Chen

Research Coordinator
Surface Transportation Policy Project (STPP)
1440 16th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 939-3470
fax: (202) 939-3475
e-mail: dchen@transact.org

Gerard Cioffi

Director, Corridor Management Group
New York State DOT, State Office Campus
1220 Washington Ave., Building 4, Room 216
Albany, New York 12232
phone: (518) 457-3429
fax: (518) 485-5637
e-mail: gcioffi@gw.dot.state.ny.us

David H. Clawson

Program Director for Policy and Planning
AASHTO
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 249
Washington, DC 20001
phone: (202) 624-5807
fax: (202) 624-5806

Carol Coleman

Principal
Cambridge Systematics
150 Cambridge Park Drive
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140
phone: (617) 354-0167
fax: (617) 354-1542
e-mail: cgc@camsys.com

John C. Cox, Jr.

President
The Partnership
21865 E. Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, California 91765
phone: (909) 396-5757
fax: (909) 396-5754
e-mail: the-partnership@worldnet.atl.com

Paul J. Cuerton

Civil Engineer
New York State DOT
1220 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12232
phone: (518) 457-1232
fax: (518) 457-1960
e-mail: pcuerton@gw.dot.state.ny.us

Allan J. DeBlasio
Project Leader, Deployment Assessment Program
Support
USDOT/Volpe Center, DTS 42
55 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
phone: (617) 494-2032
fax: (617) 494-2787
e-mail: deblasio@mailstorm.dot.gov

Hank Dittmar
Executive Director
Surface Transportation Policy Project
1400 16th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 939-3470
fax: (202) 939-3475
e-mail: hdittmar@transact.org

Robert Dunphy
Urban Land Institute
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 500W
Washington, DC 20007
phone: (202) 624-7104
fax: (202) 624-7140

John L. Duve
Senior Transportation Planner
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, California 92101
phone: (619) 595-5300
fax: (619) 595-5305
e-mail: jdu@sandag.cog.ca.us

Sheldon Edner
Community Planner
FHWA
U.S. Department of Transportation
HEP-20, RM 3232
400 7th Street, SW
phone: (202) 366-4066
fax: (202) 366-7660

Bruce Eisenhart
Systems Engineer
Lockheed Martin
9500 Godwin Drive
Manassas, Virginia 20110
phone: (703) 367-1671
fax: (703) 367-3312
e-mail: bruce.eisenhart@lmco.com

Brian Elliot
Research Fellow
Humphrey Institute
130 Humphrey Center
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
phone: (612) 626-9861
fax: (612) 626-9833
e-mail: belliot@hhh.umn.edu

Kirk D. Fauver
Air Quality Specialist
FHWA
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2079

fax: (202) 366-3409

Patrick E. Fitch
President
WyCat Associates
8401 Beech Tree Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
phone: (301) 365-3237
fax: (301) 365-0742
e-mail: patfitch@pop.dn.net

Dennis L. Foderberg
Director - ITS Institute
University of Minnesota
511 Washington Avenue, SE, Suite 200
Minneapolis, Minnesota 5545
phone: (612) 626-8285
fax: (612) 625-6381
e-mail: foder001@tc.umn.edu

Emil H. Frankel
Day, Berry & Howard
One Canterbury Green
Stamford, CT 06901
phone: (203) 977-7300
fax: (203) 977-7301
e-mail: frankee@dbh.com

Robert B. Franklin
National Business Development Manager
TRW
4751 Best Road, Suite 480
Atlanta, Georgia 30337
phone: (404) 766-7699
fax: (404) 766-7595

Loretta H. Garrison
Democratic Professional Staff
Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban
Affairs
534 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
phone: (202) 224-9213
fax: (202) 224-2080
e-mail: loretta_garrison@banking.senate.gov

Steve Gehring
ITS America
400 Virginia Avenue, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024-2730
phone: (202) 484-4589
fax: (202) 484-3489
e-mail: sgehring@itsa.org

John Gerner
Transportation Specialist
FHWA
HTV-3 RM 3408
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-9228
fax: (202) 266-8712

Ginger Gherardi
Executive Director
Ventura County Transportation Commission
950 County Square Drive #207
Ventura, CA 93003

phone: (805) 642-1591
fax: (805) 642-4860
e-mail: vctc@fishnet.net

Jonathan L. Gifford
Associate Professor
George Mason University
The Institute of Public Policy
MS 306
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
phone: (703) 993-2275
fax: (703) 993-1574
e-mail: jgifford@gmu.edu

Charlie Goodman
Chief, Metropolitan Planning
Office of Planning
Federal Transit Administration, TPL-12
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-1944
fax: (202) 493-2478
e-mail: Charles.Goodman@fta.dov.gov

Susan Grosser
FTA Community Planner
Rm. 6106-C
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-1828
fax: (202) 493-2478
e-mail: SUSAN.GROSSER@FTA.DOT.GOV

Douglas Ham
Principal
DBH Consulting
6323 North 22nd Road
Arlington, Virginia 22205-0539
phone: (703) 586-2956
fax: (703) 291-0539

Lloyd Harrison
FHWA
HTV-3, Rm. 3400
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-8710
fax: (202) 366-8712
e-mail: Lloyd.Harrison@FHWA.DOT.GOV

Richard Hartman
National Association of Regional Councils
Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
1700 K Street, NW, Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20006
phone: (202) 457-0710
fax: (202) 296-9352

Stephan Heimburg
URS Greiner, Inc.
7650 W. Courtney Campbell Causeway
Tampa, Florida 33607
phone: (813) 286-1711
fax: (813) 287-8229

William F. Hein
Deputy Executive Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Joseph P. Bort Metro Center
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, California 94607-4700
phone: (510) 464-7780
fax: (515) 464-7848
e-mail: bhein@mtc.dst.ca.us

Robert Hicks
Director, Transportation Programs
Public Technology, Inc.

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20004
phone: (202) 626-2465
fax: (202) 626-2498
e-mail: hicks@pti.nw.dc.us

Tom Horan
Executive Director
CGSRI
250 West First Street, Suite 250
Claremont, California 91711
phone: (909) 399-5650
fax: (909) 399-5658
e-mail: horant@cgs.edu

Linda Howe
Director, Technology Transfer Program
University of California, Berkeley
Institute of Transportation Studies
1355 South 46th Street, Building 452
Richmond, California 94804-4603
phone: (810) 231-5678
fax: (810) 231-9591
e-mail: lhowe@its.berkeley.edu

Tom Humphrey
FHWA
HTV-3, RM 3408
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2211
fax: (202) 266-8712

Les Jacobson
Traffic Services Manager
Washington DOT
P.O. Box 330310, MS120
15700 Dayton Avenue, N.
Seattle, Washington 98133-9710
phone: (206) 440-4487
fax: (206) 440-4804
e-mail: ljacobso@wsdot.wa.gov

Gloria J. Jeff
FHWA-Policy
Rm. 3317
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-0585
fax: (202) 366-9626
e-mail: gloria.jeff@fhwa.dot.gov

Dick John
Director
Volpe National Transportation Center
55 Broadway, Kendall Square
Cambridge, MA 02142
fax: (617) 494-3731

Daniel Jordan
Research Associate
CGS Research Institute
250 W. 1st Street Suite 254
Claremont, CA 91711
phone: (909) 399-5650
fax: (909) 399-5658
e-mail: jordand@cgs.edu

David Judd
PB Farradyne, Inc.
One Penn Plaza
New York, New York 10019
phone: (212) 465-5179
fax: (212) 465-5442

Hal Kasso

Chief Operating Officer
ITS America
400 Virginia Avenue, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024-2730
phone: (202) 484-4662
fax: (202) 484-7081
e-mail: hkasso@itsa.org

Stephanie Kolb

Traffic Management Trainee
FHWA, Region 3
10 South Howard Street, Suite 4000
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
phone: (410) 962-4818
fax: (410) 962-4586
e-mail: stephanie.kolb@fhwa.dot.gov

Walter Kraft

Senior Vice President
PB Farradyne, Inc.
One Penn Plaza
New York, New York 10119
phone: (212) 465-5724
fax: (212) 465-5442
e-mail: kraft@pbworld.com

Rich Kuzmyak

Cambridge Systems
5225 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20015
phone: (202) 466-5542
fax: (202) 466-5548
e-mail: jrk@camsys.com

Melissa M. Laube

Community Planner
USDOT/Volpe
55 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
phone: (617) 494-3559
fax: (617) 494-3260

Susan Lauffer

FHWA
HTV-1, RM 3401
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2197
fax: (202) 266-8518

Eva Lerner-Lam

President
Palisades Consulting Group, Inc.
24 West Railroad Avenue, Suite 161
Tenafly, New Jersey 07670
phone: (202) 567-0088
fax: (202) 567-8066
e-mail: elernerlam@palisadesgroup.com

Jeff Lindley

Deputy Director, ITS Joint Program Office
U.S. Department of Transportation
HVV-1, RM 3422
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2201
fax: (202) 366-3302

Steve Lockwood

Vice President
PB Farradyne, Inc.
3200 Tower Oaks Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20852

phone: (301) 468-5568
fax: (301) 816-1884
e-mail: slockwood@farradyne.com

Bill Mahorney

Transportation Specialist
Office of Highway Safety
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-6515

John Mason

Vice President
SAIC
1710 Goodridge Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102
phone: (703) 827-4941
fax: (703) 893-2187
e-mail: john.mason@cpmx.saic.com

Bruce D. McDowell

President
Intergovernmental Management Associates
10408 Gainsborough Road
Potomac, Maryland 20854
phone: (301) 299-5072
fax: (301) 299-5061
e-mail: intergov@erols.com

Tim McGuckin

Senior Planner
ITS America
400 Virginia Avenue, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024
phone: (202) 484-4847 x4546
fax: (202) 484-3483

Andrew J. Meese

Senior Transportation Engineer
Metro Washington COG
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239
phone: (202) 962-3789
fax: (202) 962-3202

John C. Merritt

Principal Traffic Engineer
City of Colorado Springs
Traffic Engineering Division
P.O. Box 1575, Mail Code 1147
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901
phone: (719) 578-6702
fax: (719) 578-6704

Jose-Luis Mesa

Director
Metro-Dade County
Metropolitan Planning Organization
111 NW First Street, Suite 910
Miami, Florida 33128
phone: (305) 375-4507
fax: (305) 375-4950

Juan M. Morales

J.M. Morales & Associates
11320 Dockside Circle
Reston, VA 20191
phone: (703) 648-8691
fax: (703) 648-8692
e-mail: jmmassoc@aol.com

Mitchell Moss

Director

New York University, Wagner School
Taub Urban Research Center
4 Washington Square North
New York, New York 10003
phone: (212) 998-6677
fax: (212) 995-3890
e-mail: moss@is2.nyu.edu

Thomas O. Mottl
Principal
Stratec Consulting
38 Montvale Avenue, Suite 200
Stoneham, Massachusetts 02180
phone: (617) 279-7990
fax: (617) 279-7990
e-mail: mottl@tiac.net

Richard R. Mudge, PhD.
Chairman of the Board
Apogee Research, Inc.
4350 East West Highway, Sixth Floor
Bethesda, Maryland 20904
phone: (301) 652-8444
fax: (301) 654-9355
e-mail: mudge@apogee_us.com

Lee W. Munnich, Jr.
Senior Fellow and Director
University of Minnesota
State and Local Policy Program
154 HHH Center, 301 19th Avenue, South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
phone: (612) 625-2357
fax: (612) 626-9833
e-mail: lmunnich@hhh.umn.edu

Mark R. Norman
Deputy Executive Director
ITE
525 School Street, SW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20024
phone: (202) 554-8050
fax: (202) 863-5486
e-mail: mnorman@vax.ite.org

Graham Norton
Director
Department of Public Works and Transportation
Montgomery County
101 Monroe Street, 10th Floor
Rockville, Maryland 20850
phone: (301) 217-2170
fax: (301) 217-2118
e-mail: graham.norton@co.mo.md.us

Janet Oakley
Director of Transportation
National Association of Regional Councils
1700 K Street, NW, Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20006
phone: (202) 457-0170
fax: (202) 296-9352

Jon Obenberger
U.S. DOT, FHWA
Office of Traffic Management and ITS Applications
400 7th Street, SW, Room 3408, HTV-3
Washington, DC 22201
phone: (202) 366-2221
fax: (202) 366-8712
e-mail: jobenber@fhwa.dot.gov

Hon. James L. Oberstar
D-Minnesota
U.S. House of Representatives
2366 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-22306
202/225-6211
fax: 202/225-0699

Gene Ofstead
Assistant Commissioner
Minnesota DOT
395 John Ireland Boulevard
417 Transportation Building, Room 417, MS140
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
phone: (612) 296-1344
fax: (612) 282-2656
e-mail: gene.ofstead@dot.state.mn.us

John Olson
Manager, Traffic Management Systems
Metro Transit Authority (Houston)
c/o ITS America
400 Virginia Avenue, SW #800
Washington, DC 20024
phone: (202) 484-4139
fax: (202) 484-3483
e-mail: jolson@itsa.org

C. Kenneth Orski
President
Urban Mobility Corporation
1015 17th Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 775-0311
fax: (202) 775-4867
e-mail: korski@erols.com

Robert Paaswell
Director
The City College of New York
University Transportation Research Center
Y-220
New York, New York 10031
phone: (212) 650-8050
fax: (212) 650-8374
e-mail: paaswell@tid150.engr.ccnycmy.edu

Edith B. Page
Manager, Infrastructure and Transportation
Bechtel Corporation
1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-2605
phone: (202) 828-7375
fax: (202) 785-2645
e-mail: epage@bechtel.com

Henry L. Peyrebrune
Center for Transportation Policy and Management
420 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, New York 12054
phone: (518) 439-7133
fax: (518) 439-1401
e-mail: henpeyre@aol.com

Christopher Poe
Director, TransLink
Texas Transportation Institute
TTI/CE Building, 410C
College Station, Texas 77843
phone: (409) 845-1536
fax: (409) 845-6001

e-mail: cpoe@ttiadmin.tamu.edu

Laurel Radow

Transportation Specialist
Federal Highway Administration
Rm.3400, HTV-3
U.S. DOT
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2855
fax: (202) 366-8712
laurel.radow@fhwa.dot.gov

Michael Replogle

Co-Director, Transportation Project
Environmental Defense Fund
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
phone: (202) 387-3500
fax: (202) 234-6049
e-mail: michaelr@edf.org

Robert C. Ricci

Deputy Director
Volpe National Transportation Systems Center
Office of Research and Analysis
55 Broadway, Kendall Square
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
phone: (617) 494-2343
fax: (617) 494-3064
e-mail: ricci@volpe1.dot.gov

Gary Ritter

ITS Program Coordinator
Volpe National Transportation Systems Center
55 Broadway (DTS-21)
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
phone: (617) 494-2716
fax: (617) 494-2370
e-mail: ritter@volpe1.dot.gov

D. Craig Roberts

Director, Policy and Partnerships
ITS America
400 Virginia Avenue, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024-2730
phone: (202) 484-2895
fax: (202) 484-3483
e-mail: croberts@itsa.org

James R. Robinson

Director of ITS Program
Commonwealth of Virginia DOT
1401 East Broad Street, Room 207
Richmond, Virginia 23219
phone: (804) 786-6677
fax: (804) 225-4978

Barbara Rohde

Research Fellow
Humphrey Institute
1701 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
phone: (202) 223-0964
fax: (202) 223-1393
e-mail: brohde@hhh.umn.edu

George Schoene

Team Coordinator, Office of Traffic
Management & ITS Applications
FHWA
HTV-30, RM 3400
400 7th Street SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-2197
fax: (202) 366-8515

James A. Scott

Senior Program Officer
Transportation Research Board
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418
phone: (202) 334-2968
fax: (202) 334-2299

Michael J. Shiffer

Director, Computer Research Labs
MIT
Department of Urban Studies and Planning
77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room 9-514
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307
phone: (617) 253-0782
fax: (617) 253-3625
e-mail: mshiffer@mit.edu

Sigmund Silber

Principal
S. Silber and Associates
143 Hoyt Street, Apt. 6G
Stamford, Connecticut 06905
phone: (202) 327-0099
fax: (202) 327-6680
e-mail: ssilber@village.ios.com

Frank Southworth

Leader, Transportation Planning and Policy
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831-6206
phone: (423) 576-8153
fax: (423) 574-3895
e-mail: sou@ornl.gov

Robert (Bob) Stout

Director of Planning Operations
Federal Transit Administration
TPL-10, RM 6436
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-1628
fax: (202) 493-2478

Joseph Sussman

Professor
MIT
77 Mass Avenue, 1-163
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
phone: (617) 258-4430
fax: (617) 258-5942
e-mail: sussman@mit.edu

Peggy Tedaj

Director of Business Development for ITS
Kaman Sciences
2560 Huntington Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22303

phone: (703) 329-4973
fax: (703) 960-0643
e-mail: tadej_alxl@kamancom

KT Thirumalai
TRB Program Manager
Transportation Research Board
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418
phone: (202) 334-3568
fax: (202) 334-3471
e-mail: kthiruma@nas.edu

Edward L. Thomas
Associate Administrator, Office of Research
Demonstration & Innovation
FTA
TRI-1, RM 6431
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-4052
fax: (202) 366-3765
e-mail: EDWARD.THOMAS@FTA.DOT.GOV

David Van Hattum
Research Fellow
Humphrey Institute
157 Humphrey Center
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
phone: (612) 625-1017
fax: (612) 626-9833
e-mail: dvan@hhh.umn.edu

Kenneth Voorhies
Supervising Engineer
PB Farradyne
3340 Peachtree Road, Suite 2400
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
phone: (404) 364-8183
fax: (404) 842-0247
e-mail: kvoorhies@pbworld.com

Rich Weaver
Director, Planning and Programs
APTA
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
phone: (202) 898-4109
fax: (202) 898-4049

Douglas Wiersig
Executive Director
Houston TranStar
6922 Old Katy Road
Houston, Texas 77024
phone: (713) 881-3007
fax: (713) 881-3006

Stein Weissenberger
Manager, Transportation Management Systems
Research
UC Berkeley-PATH Program
1301 South 46th Street, Building 452
Richmond, California 94804
phone: (510) 231-5630
fax: (510) 231-9565
e-mail: weissenberger@llnl.gov

Daniel A. Worke
Signal Systems Analyst
Arlington County, Traffic Eng. Division
Arlington, Virginia 22201
phone: (703) 358-3722
fax: (703) 358-3719
e-mail: dworke@co.arlington.va.us

Katie Wyrosdick
Highway Engineer
FHWA
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-1712
fax: (202) 366-8712
e-mail: katie.wyrosdick@fhwa.dot.gov

David A. Zavattero
Deputy for Operations
Chicago Area Transportation Study
300 West Adams Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606-0772
hone: (312) 793-0360
fax: (312) 793-3481

Barry Zimmer
FHWA
Transportation Specialist
HTV-3 RM 3408
400 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20590
phone: (202) 366-4082
fax: (202) 266-8712

APPENDIX: SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

ITS: Reauthorization Challenges Intelligent Transportation Systems

**Luncheon Speech
Representative
James L. Oberstar**

Monday, December 16, 1996

ITS: REAUTHORIZATION CHALLENGES
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
James L. Oberstar
At the 21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium
December 16, 1996

When French President Charles de Gaulle first launched the TGV, the *train a grande vitesse* or very high speed train, his advisors all told him that it would be too expensive, the country couldn't afford it. President de Gaulle simply responded, "Does any other country have such a technology?"

As a student at the College of Europe many years ago I took the old train from Paris to Lyons, then a journey of four and one-half hours. In 1989, I took the same trip on the TGV. That trip took two hours and one minute. In 1988, the year before I took the trip, 500,000 people took the train to Lyons, and three million took the plane. Today, 500,000 go to Lyons by air, three and one-half million by train. This is intelligent traveling.

There are many definitions and many measures of intelligence, but one is the ability to invent, to innovate, to find new solutions, rather than slugging away at a problem with old ideas. If our current approach to solving congestion, pollution, and 40,000 highway deaths a year—pouring more concrete and more asphalt—sounds like slugging away at a problem rather than solving it, then it's time for an *intelligent* approach to the future of transportation: an Intelligent Transportation System.

We launched this approach in 1991, with ISTEA, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. While people fully understood what Congress was about in writing this Act, they didn't fully appreciate that it marked the end of the Interstate Era and the beginning of a new era of transportation in its broadest context. With the help of Intelligent Transportation Systems, or ITS, we can put more cars on existing concrete, but that's only the start for an intelligent approach to transportation. We can expand the use of existing roadways to make them more efficient, especially in places where there really isn't any more space to pour more concrete. I'm for building and improving roads, don't get me wrong, but I also understand there needs to be a balance as we approach the reauthorization of ISTEA. We need to approach this problem with the understanding that it is about *transportation*, not just *highways*. We used to call it the Highway Bill when it came to the House Floor. As long as we continue to think of transportation as moving people and goods rather than as highways per se, we will be in a good position to do good things for the future of this country.

Our schedule for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for 1997 is beginning to take shape. The first bill that Chairman Bud Shuster and I will introduce will take the Highway and other transportation trust funds off budget. We got an overwhelming two-and-one-half-to-one margin vote on this bill in the House last year, but the Senate refused to take it up. I am sympathetic to the concerns about the impact such a move might have on social service programs—but taking the Trust Funds off budget is only fair. In 1956, when the Highway Trust Fund was accepted, the purpose was to create a dedicated revenue stream to see to completion the 42,000-mile Interstate program. It all worked well until about 1968 when Lyndon Johnson, at the peak of the Vietnam War, became concerned about inflation, and began to hold the money back from the Highway program in order to dampen the overheating economy. The Trust Fund money couldn't be spent on anything else, so it stayed in reserve, and grew and helped to conceal the deficit that the government was beginning to run in defense of Vietnam.

The Nixon Administration came in and found this little nest egg and liked it so much they kept more back, as did every President since. At one point, a \$19 billion surplus had built up in the Highway Trust Fund.

We are going to move on this issue as quickly as the leadership will permit us to get that bill through Committee, to the Floor and a vote and, hopefully, put the pressure on the Senate to do the same. I can also tell you that Chairman Shuster and I are going to have a very cooperative relationship in our Committee in the coming Congress as we did in the past Congress. Bud Shuster and I have worked very closely together for 22 years and before even that, when I was the Administrator for the Public Works Committee Staff during his first term on the Committee. I've always said there's no such thing as a Democratic bridge or a Republican highway.

Any disagreements won't be between parties, but between varying views of the future of transportation. There's the urban view, the suburban view, the rural view, the freight view and the passenger view. There will be a procession of governors who want to have the authority returned to them, or have their hands freed by having fewer program categories. They want to have a greater decision-making authority. In my view, if they want to make those decisions then they can raise the money. They can spend all the State money they want on what they want, but if Congress is going to raise the taxes and take the heat, then we're going to have to have a say in how these National programs are run.

At the end of the ISTEA process, I think we'll find the Act essentially as it is now, with some modifications or adjustments within overall programs. I'm certainly going to be a strong advocate for retaining ITS, which has been funded to the tune of more than a billion dollars over the past five years.

But there is no guarantee that ITS or other non-highway programs will remain. Should ITS continue to enjoy a set-aside? Should it be considered an operational program that States may but don't have to spend money on? Is it a required category, or just another way of manipulating money for the State, competing for dollars with conventional highways? How are we going to get the State Departments of Transportation, mayors, county commissioners and communities to spend their highway dollars on this new, relatively untried, unfamiliar technology when they have potholes to fill, shoulders to expand, roadways to improve? It's going to take the ITS community and enlightened State DOT Directors to get involved in the ISTEA debate and not get steamrolled by the old ideas and the old ways. I hope that forums like this, and the one we had last summer at the Humphrey Institute in Minneapolis, will help generate the ideas that go not only to Congress but to the State Highway Departments and Legislatures. You're going to need all people working together.

The focus has to be on **transportation**; on moving people and goods in the most efficient, least expensive, most environmentally sound and safest manner possible. We are not just talking about getting more cars on a given stretch of concrete, but getting people and goods to their destinations in the most effective, efficient ways.

Yes, we can coordinate green wave traffic lights; use traffic lights to admit cars one-at-a-time to freeways; identify congestion and route traffic around it; and use smart cards to avoid long lines and pollution at toll booths.

But we also have to think about the inner cities. How do you move poor people from one part of the city to another part? People need transportation to hold jobs. If we are going to get people off welfare and into employment, then we have to tailor our transportation to individual needs rather than just build more lanes on Beltways or new "outer Beltways" that immediately become as congested as the Inner Beltway.

The commercial sector has an equal need and application for Intelligent Transportation Systems. The Commercial Vehicle Information Systems Network, or CVISN, will provide many benefits in term of safety (automatic truck weight and safety checks; HAZMAT spill responses); efficiency (paperwork reductions—the "paperless" truck where all documents are computerized; GPS tracking; fleet management) and business efficiency. By 2005 it's possible that transactions among carriers, shippers, government agencies and insurance companies will all be done electronically.

But, of course, there are barriers to the deployment of these ideas, not only to getting the ideas out for public acceptance,

but also to getting them implemented. That means getting people at the State level to feel comfortable with ITS. State highway engineers are wonderful. They may not know how to build new technology with their transportation systems, so we need to expand the ideas coming out of research institutes and putting them in the hands of the highway engineers, planners, developers, builders, so that we integrate these new concepts into existing systems, and provide full-scale deployment in our transportation systems of the future.

Today, the State of Minnesota is, I think, very much advanced in all of these areas. They are using TV cameras to monitor freeway traffic so that commuters as well as highway traffic managers can see what the traffic looks like, and reroute traffic if needed. Minnesota is also creating in-vehicles maps. In the future, with Geographical Information Systems, drivers will be able to have a map readout in their own cars so they can see what's ahead before they get into a traffic jam. They can see where the accident is, and get around it, using the most efficient means to get from home to work or wherever they are going. We also need to make regular use of the fiber-optic cable systems and develop software and deploy it. In aviation, it's taken well over a decade to develop the new air traffic control technology that is being installed piece by piece. A lot of that aviation technology can be borrowed for surface transportation ITS.

Last Friday I had a meeting with a five-county group in the southern part of my Congressional District where we were trying to deal with a new phenomenon. This area is about 60 miles out of downtown Minneapolis/St. Paul. Many of those folks keep their jobs in the Twin Cities but move their families to the rural communities where the quality of living is better, the schools are good, and where they have a closer family association. They want to get to and from work in the most efficient way possible so that they can spend more time with Little League, with all the softball games, and at the hockey rink and weekend recreation. They hate the commute. They want car pools, van pools; they want transit systems; they want to make their movement to and from work as efficient and enjoyable as they possibly can.

The population movement of the 1990s is less city to suburb than between suburbs. The movement of commerce and business has been from suburb to suburb and now into ex-urbia. We have to follow up our transportation systems so that we respond to these new realities, as we go into the next century, so that our transportation systems reflect the needs and the interests of our mobile population, who want to live far out, and commute close in, in record time. The concept of designing the transportation system to meet the needs of the people and trying to stay ahead of these needs is what ISTEA is all about. This is why we created a role for Metropolitan Planning Organizations, which would involve more than the engineers, more than the governors, and reach out to the people whose lives and livelihoods are directly impacted by transportation.

A few years ago I traveled to Houston to talk about the future of infrastructure and learned there that the average speed on the Houston Beltway for four hours during morning rush and four more during evening rush is 17 miles per hour. The average is about 15 miles per hour on the Capital Beltway in Washington, D.C. There will be a time when all the cars on a freeway are just stuck. They are not going to move. Now, before that happens we who sit here today must think about the transportation needs of the future and realize that the folks who are wasting hundreds of dollars a year in traffic congestion, with its delays, frayed tempers and air pollution, are going to come back to us and say: "YOU FAILED!" "You didn't do your job. You didn't think adequately about the future. You responded only to the needs of the present."

That is what ISTEA is about. That is what Intelligent Vehicle Transportation Systems are all about. As business centers have cropped up in the suburbs, and housing spread to ex-urbia, and cars and trucks circulate between suburbs and between suburb and ex-urbia as well as in and out of our major cities, we have to develop transportation systems that continue to adapt to meet these needs. We have to be more like Charles de Gaulle and say not "How much does it cost?" but "Is it the best that we can do?" Can we look toward the horizon and say, "We are ahead of the curve, not behind it?"

That is what a symposium like this is all about; and those are the ideas that I hope will come out of this conference in the

next few days.

I wish you well, and thank you for being here today.

**Opening Remarks
Edward L. Thomas
Associate Administrator
Office of Research Demonstration and Innovation
Federal Transit Administration**

Monday, December 16, 1996

**21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium:
Linking Regional Planning and Operations
for Effective ITS Deployment**

December 16, 1996

Suggested Talking Points for Edward Thomas, Associate Administrator

Good morning, to those of you traveling from outside the Washington Metropolitan Area, welcome to our Nation's Capital, and to the many familiar faces I see, greetings.

I want to start by thanking Dennis Judycki, Associate Administrator for Traffic Management and ITS Applications, and Tom Ptak, Associate Administrator for Program Development, and their staffs at FHWA for organizing this symposium. Let me also thank my former colleagues in the FTA Office of Planning and my team in the FTA Office of Research, Demonstration, and Innovation.

Having spent 50 percent of my career in transportation planning and the other 50 percent in research, development, and demonstration of innovations, the subject of this symposium is near and dear to me professionally.

More importantly, a stronger bond between transportation planning and operations is essential if we are to realize the anticipated benefits of ITS technology. Advanced information and communication systems provide the planning profession with opportunities to obtain models capable of analyzing short-range, multimodal, and intermodal improvements and public involvement techniques.

Fortunately, discoveries over the last twenty five years position planning to move responsively into the 21st century. Among these discoveries are: large, fast, yet inexpensive computers, geographic information systems, global positioning satellites, multimodal network models, household and activity-based demand models, and improved optimization algorithms.

Transit operators and managers are challenged with gaining a stronger understanding of their various markets, tailoring services and prices accordingly, and generally improving the quality of transit service by reducing travel time and improving safety and security.

Local and state system managers are constantly reminded of the need to maintain the highest level of service on our streets, freeways, and toll roads; to provide real-time information on the condition of the system so that travelers can plan their trips accordingly, and to offer incentives for more effective travel demand management.

Unless ITS becomes integrated into the systems planning process by demonstrating an ability to improve planning tools and to enhance system performance, ITS risks being confined to the sidelines of transportation decision-making.

As Secretary Peña called for in his announcement of Operation TimeSaver, the various ITS technologies must be integrated into a system-wide Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure (ITI). Only then can we realize the full benefits of the advanced technologies and have ITS evaluated as valid alternatives to transportation capacity improvements.

This symposium is a great step toward mainstreaming ITS. It is exciting to see such a wonderful mix of skills and organizations committed to bringing this effort about. Because only through such integration can ITS reach its potential.

ITS integration into the transportation mainstream faces many challenges, some technical and others institutional in nature. But, I'm confident in our ability to identify the critical issues and find the right solutions.

FTA Administrator Linton fully supports the Department's ITS and ITI Initiative and is encouraging efforts to mainstream proven systems and technologies.

The FTA Office of Research, Demonstration, and Innovation is committed to working closely with our Planning, Program Management, and Regional Offices and others to ensure that FTA's ITS program component is properly coordinated. In addition, we in FTA will continue to work closely with FHWA, FRA, and NHTSA to ensure development of an intermodal seamless transportation system.

In closing, FTA is an important player in the Department's ITS Initiative. We have already demonstrated that information and communication-based technologies can improve safety and security, increase the throughput of transit fleets, enhance the performance of transit equipment and infrastructure, and deliver more specialized and accessible services to low income, elderly, and other transit dependent populations.

To make our research, development, and innovation programs relevant, our reauthorization proposal is for a joint partnership initiative.

**Presentation and Handout
Stephen Lockwood
Vice President, PB Farradyne, Inc.
Policy and Technology
Challenges and Opportunities**

Monday, December 16, 1996

21st CENTURY TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Agenda “mainstreaming” ITS

- a) Basic assumption: ITS (broadest interpretation) is the future of service improvements
- b) Multiple levels of interpretation irrelevant
- c) From: immediate/programmatic (and necessarily constrained); to long-term/sectoral (and potentially broad)

2. Point of departure: both “evolutionary” and “visionary” points of view are necessary: The vision provides a vector for the longer range, more aggressive 21st century transportation development. Elements of the vision need to be reflected in short-range policy such as ISTEA reauthorization

3. Short-term/“evolutionary” program: modify planning/programming process to implement ITI (within the Federal-aid program) evolutionary program: accepts short-run limitations of context

- a) objective: deploy ITI nationally as a baseline
- b) assumes existing sectoral roles (public infrastructure monopoly) and complex jurisdictional structure
- c) accepts operations as modest State/Local priority and limited resources earmarked to ITI
- d) recognizes minor short-run changes in owner organizational structure/staff capacity possible
- e) accepts traditional arms length relationships with private service providers
- f) dependence on “champions” — assumes political/institutional rewards modest or unclear

4. Within the near-term horizon (H1) context: potential NexTEA ITS elements focus on generating visible deployment

- a) O & M funding eligibility
- b) ITS planning/programming focus
- c) grant conditioned to ITS standards
- d) incentives for systems integration
- e) emphasis on innovative finance (public/private partnerships, state infrastructure banks)

- f) “op tests” for operations planning
 - g) procurement deregulation
 - h) training
 - i) R&D at metro level
5. **Bottom line: recognize limits of available Federal aid program points of leverage in the current political context of: deficit finance, devolution, anti-mandates, multiple competing priorities within Federal-Aid transportation program, etc.**
- a) Within that (H1) context: potential NexTEA ITS elements focus on generating visible deployment and capacity building
 - b) These actions crucial to maintaining program momentum and credibility
6. **Evolutionary view is necessary (and a real challenge given lack of financial incentives) — but not sufficient**
7. **A “visionary” component — a new paradigm for 21st century surface transportation — is necessary to set the direction of future change in the “TEAs” beyond NexTEA**
8. **This longer range horizon vision (H-3) is based on the presumption that there will be consumer demand for significant “progress” in transportation-related services in the 21st century — as there has been in other public service sectors — and that the general institutional configuration will trend towards the dominant private enterprise model.**
9. **The vision presumes future “transportation”**
- a) service is *the* mission — not just *one of many* missions
 - b) as a new product: a bundle of services (schedule adherence/routing/safety/security/support & amenity)
 - c) focused on traffic-responsive operations of the upper level network of transportation facilities in real time
 - d) utilizing the full range of supply management tools
 - e) combined with comprehensive in-vehicle information and safety systems
 - f) as well as managing demand (by mode/route/time etc.) through the provision of priced facilities and special service options (for both passenger and freight) (see Appendix A)
10. **This vision implies a large number of new service components organized by**

information/communications into a consistent systems framework by a market-oriented combination of revenue-driven service providers — the essence of ITS

11. Principal challenges to be addressed are institutional/financial

- a) prioritizing operations and service — rather than construction and preservation
- b) developing coordinated metropolitan system operations/management
- c) inducing consumer demand — markets — with service options and prices
- d) introducing enterprise management and high-tech staff capabilities
- e) utilizing private resources for facility operations as well as provision
- f) supplementing on-budget tax funds with a range of beneficiary and customer-based revenues to support private investment
- g) aligning intermodal infrastructure with modern freight logistics
- h) monetizing consumption of valued natural resources
- i) replacing “planning” with performance-based evaluation

12. Major institutional and financial innovation are required to support this reorganization of surface transportation sector

13. But needed changes may not be so radical as they seem

- a) context is shifting (see Appendix B)
- b) other sectors (power, telcoms, water are moving in many of the same directions)
- c) privatization (toll-support enterprise management) is global trend in transport
- d) historic U.S. transportation institutions innovation was part of Interstate
- e) already bellwether examples in U.S.

14. These factors in combination suggest that “progress” (if defined as identifiable customer-responsive transportation services) are inevitable. The question is when and how

15. The type of institutional and financial structure is exemplified in conventions of other public service/facilities systems (and, increasingly upper level highways systems overseas). These are increasingly price-based, competitive, privately managed “enterprises” and which transportation might approximate if it is to be an efficient, service-oriented, high-tech evolving sector

16. **The key barriers to the visionary future are principally institutional and financial. Some key barriers marginally affected by limited F-A program leverage and “soft” Federal aid program incentives. Therefore as we develop an evolutionary policy/program agenda, we also need to incorporate elements that are oriented to laying the ground work, opening the door for significant institutional/financial change “Beyond NexTEA”**
17. **Therefore Agenda for “Beyond NexTEA” should introduce strong emphasis on evolving a suitable institutional/finance framework: “bring the future forward” with a focus on getting a best case (“models”) rather than raising lowest common denominator (“institutional MDIs”)**
18. **Transition steps can be initiated in NexTEA:**
 - a) Raise public and service providers’ expectations through system performance focus, benchmarking and incentives to prioritize the “operational mission” (management systems?)
 - b) Reduce dependence on HTF by permitting tolls on Interstate and empowering regional development of pricing programs on network basis using HOV/HOT lane incremental approaches
 - c) Focus on institutional innovation for operations/management through “Institutional Op tests” such as incentivizing new “Metropolitan Operating Authorities” for upper-level systems on an enterprise basis (move through “4-Cs”)
 - d) Create strong dialogue towards national cooperation with service provider/players at national level to minimize barriers to in-vehicle and related communications services
 - e) Dialogue re cross-sectoral support at the national level of substantial O & M costs associated with ITS for transportation-related service providers (emergency services, law enforcement)
 - f) Consider stronger incentives to induce/support private investment in both facility ownership and service provision by minimizing public subsidy of potential enterprise-based activities. “Make” markets by developing “take or pay” approaches to activities conventionally provided by public sector (“enterprise impact statement”)
 - g) Incentivize State/Local experimentation by bellwether states outside FA program context via funded Technical Experiment Program (TE) and op tests focusing on premium priced services, streamline procurement, new types of concessions for both roadway improvements and ITS services
 - h) Encourage transition to private management by staging through managed competition, shadow prices, franchises with new “public interest rules”
 - i) Undertake examination of infrastructure operations implications of contemporary logistics jointly with private freight/intermodal industry

- j) Consider ITS requirements on NAFTA/Intercontinental Highway System with ATMS/ATIS requirements and Mexican/Canadian continuity
- k) Establish ITS Academy

19. These concepts should be embodied in policy and program in both Federal and state levels. In particular, their inclusion in NexTEA will establish some important vectors that subsequent policy and program evolution can build on towards realization of the 21st Century Vision

20. Closure

APPENDIX A: LONG RANGE VISION FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Backcasting: A Vision from the Future

Realization of 21st century transportation improvements (ITS?) is likely to depend substantially to the capacity to evolve institutions that can capitalize on information, command, control and computation technology — just as the benefits of autobahn technology depended on the invention of the Interstate program, state DOTs and metropolitan planning. To envision the possibilities unlocked from today's discouraging inertia, let us “backcast” from the year 2050 in which metropolitan transportation by definition would have achieved the same measure of supply options and demand management as realized in other public service sectors like telecommunication and power. It is instructive to describe a possible path connecting such a future with the present as a future transport historian might recall it:

The “Post Interstate” Era didn't really begin until early in the 21st century when transportation agencies gradually evolved into systems operators and service providers. As far back as the 2025, progressive states had already begun to develop priced toll networks on the upper level highway systems together with consistent application of advanced traffic operations and demand management.

To supplement public agency resources some of these facilities were developed and operated as private franchises while others were publicly-operated. Gradually, however, the exacting demands of operating and financing evolving technology led to new forms of collaboration between public highway agencies and major private transport and technology companies.

Various competing “Transcorps” were formed as public/private commercial consortia—to operate consolidated networks on a multijurisdictional basis. For example, the California Transport Department joined with Microsoft, Motorola and PacTel to form “Western Transcorp” whose shares are traded on the stock market to raise capital for highway automation.

With their long-term competitively-bid franchises and financing improvements out of road prices, the transcorps embarked on an aggressive program of improvements and innovation in major corridors.

Non-intrusive traffic detection technology and the original equipment vehicle location tags on all vehicles provided the basis for this new level of management. The transcorps used the combination of real time traffic information and pricing to moderate peak demand and to allocate the available capacity on a demand-responsive basis. At the same time, the Transcorps were able to send routing time advisories directly to personal communication devices to aid in traveler decisions.

Starting in the 2020s, drivers began receiving discounts if they use pre-trip registration, which allows the transcorps to more closely predict future traffic volume and patterns and anticipate problems. As a result, system operators in high demand areas are able to take reservations and guarantee arrival trip times. It is not surprising that the business of “guaranteed arrival time” insurance grew up about that time.

Electronic billing services keep track of time, distance, and type of service through embedded smart cards. Customers receive their transport bills consolidated with their communications bills so they can make the appropriate personal tradeoffs. “Congestion” is now an obsolete term because we use variable pricing and capacity manipulation to offer consistent service—just as had long been the pattern in telecommunications and power—way back in the 20th century.

The improving technologies of communications, command and control, combined with application of prices tended to dissolve modal distinctions. “One-size-fits-all” transit vehicles disappeared as smaller vehicles operation in a demand-responsive regime. Receiving preferential treatment on priced roadways offered a range of efficiencies and price combinations tailored to trip patterns and densities. Transit fleets were also to see the first significant operation of non-carbon propulsion.

Safety and environmental values had made enormous inroads into vehicle technology. The “new generation vehicles” of the 2010s combining hybrid drivetrain power, cleaner fuels, energy storage, light weight and advanced catalysts had tripled efficiency and substantially reduced rate of CO² and NO_x production. At the same time on-board crash avoidance systems and guideway based “hands/feet off” operations led to “automated highway” intercity speeds limits of 150 miles per hour as well as advanced urban bus and truck platooning.

Traditional national and state transport agencies found themselves with important new roles providing policy and regulatory guidance to metropolitan transport operations commercialized via the transcorps. Two major challenges of the mid-21st century were integrating the local tax supported roads with the upper level priced network and developing the schedule of fees and incentives designed to incentive the gradual decrease of dependency on petroleum-based fuels and to encourage systems development with minimal ecological impacts.

Full-cost pricing was not achieved without considerable struggle and spread only gradually from the bellwether states as they were able to demonstrate the new forms of metropolitan transportation and land-use systems that offered predictable service and preserved their environmental resources. Even today in 2050, customers may grumble somewhat about the higher prices, but most believe the higher delay-free travel and improved environmental quality is well worth the price.

APPENDIX B: TRENDS/FACTORS CHALLENGING EXISTING INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Consumer demand

- higher value of time (competitiveness)
- performance expectation of perfect system info
- more price/quality options
- increased use/demand

Infrastructure (infostructure?) Supply

- new technology push (leading sector impacts)
- information-intensivity (C2+IS)
- comms will be ubiquitous & create pressure
- network/system oriented

Institutional trends

- deficit budgets
- deregulation/devolution
- commercialization
- new services

ITS Reality is different

- layers show impact of comms/info
- sausage (small component that is part of conventional DPW)
- “mobility services” are necessarily a partnership among infrastructure, user and other service providers (institutional complexity)

APPENDIX C: PROGRAM CONCEPTS

1. Facilities consolidated into “seamless” operated networks
 - a) adoption of O & M as priority mission of infrastructure owners
 - b) development of operational capability
 - (1) staff technical capacity for operations
 - (2) real-time O & M coordination
 - (3) real-time IM capability
 - c) forming of new interjurisdictional relationships
 - (1) vertical (S/L)
 - (2) horizontal (local/local)
 - (3) intersectoral (policy, emergency, etc.)
 - (4) develop new operating agencies (MOPs)
2. Bundled services: not just “capacity” (ex: (routing/security/safety/yellow pages))
 - a) integrate non-operations features working with private and other providers
 - b) establish clearinghouse or ISP
 - c) new forms of relationships with national players (automotive, information)
3. System performance as key objective
 - a) develop new mission priority in public works environment
 - b) use performance data to judge institutional progress
 - c) enterprise management style (incentives)
4. Revenue flow via commercialized user services (priced)
 - a) capitalize on tolling opportunities
 - b) open IS to tolls
 - c) grow toll networks
 - d) expand congestion pricing program (use HOT lane evolution as strategy)
5. Investor ownership with capital/operations/financed from revenue stream)
 - a) eliminate state/local legal constraints to commingling, concessions, etc.
 - b) eliminate tax constraints to private investment and management
 - c) develop competitive franchises, concessions for facilities, networks
 - d) work with private sector to expand service bundle on fee basis
 - e) shift to private management (in stages) through concessions with shadow pricing to actual user-fee based franchises
6. Introduction of competition (deregulate existing monopoly)
 - a) competitively bid outsourcing of certain functions currently public (managed competition)
 - b) develop new forms of partnerships with ranges of risk/reward sharing
7. Provision of premium/discount and specialized services options for consumer markets
 - a) maximum flexible, segmentable facilities (express/local/reversible)
 - b) develop HOV/HOT lane options
 - c) develop intelligent intercontinental (NAFTA) system (ITS on IS plus border crossing plus Canada, Mexico trunks)

- d) develop staff/legal capacity to procure evolving technology
- 8. Enterprise management structure (possibly privatized)
 - a) establish enterprise independence from legislative/political interference
 - b) place management rewards on performance basis
- 9. Public interest focus on policy and regulation—not production of service
- 10. Incorporation of external costs (full cost pricing?)
 - a) use environmental costs as discriminator in investments
- 11. Capitalizing on new technology for value-added options and efficiency improvements

ENTERING WEDGES FOR 21st CENTURY SYSTEM

1. Raise expectations through system performance focus/mission.
2. Empower regional pricing programs on network basis.
3. Incentivize new "metropolitan operating authorities."
4. Create closer national industry cooperation with service and product providers/players (public and private).
5. Minimize public conduct/subsidy of potential enterprise-based activities to "make a market" and attract investment.
6. Incentivize state/local experimentation by bellwether states outside FA context (ex: premium services, new forms of public/private partnerships).
7. Stage to private management via managed competition, shadow prices, franchises with new "public interest rules."
8. Examine operational implications of contemporary logistics jointly with private freight/intermodal industry.
9. Consider ITS requirements on NAFTA/Intercontinental Highway System with Mexican/Canadian continuity.
10. Establish ITS Academy.

**Presentation
Joseph Sussman
Professor, MIT
Strategic Planning Issues**

Monday, December 16, 1996

WHY ITS DEPLOYMENT IS HARD

SYSTEMIC NATURE OF ITS

Vehicles and Infrastructure

Public and Private Resources

THE BASIC ITS INSIGHT: TRANSPORTATION AS A LINKED VEHICLE/INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEM

ITS-4 TECHNOLOGIES

— **SENSING**

— **COMMUNICATING**

— **PROCESSING**

— **METHODS**

WHY ITS DEPLOYMENT IS HARD — II

ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS

Academia — New Transportation Professional

State, Local and Federal Government

Private Sector (Siemens Example)

WHY ITS DEPLOYMENT IS HARD — IV

ITS' ADVANTAGES DON'T MESH WITH POLITICAL REALITIES

Intermodalism

Regional Scale

HANDOUTS FROM PRESENTATION

Surface Transportation Policy Project Progress, Volume VI, Number 1, January–February 1996

From the Director's Chair

“Technologies and Sustainability—Not Necessarily a Contradiction”
by Hank Dittmar, Executive Director

“Transportation and Information Technologies for Sustainable Technologies”
by Dave Van Hattum, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

“Communicating for Better Transit”
by Janet S. Hathaway, Natural Resources Defense Council, Senior Attorney

“Technology applications for Rural America”
by Christopher Bender, Surface Transportation Policy Project Communications Coordinator

These articles are reprinted with permission from STPP's *January/February Progress*. *Progress* is available for free. For copies, call 202/466-2636.

From the Director's Chair:
“Technologies and Sustainability—Not Necessarily a Contradiction”
by Hank Dittmar, Executive Director

Secretary of Transportation Federico Peña announced a new technology initiative at the 75th annual meeting of the Transportation Research Board. *Operation TimeSaver* has the goal of equipping seventy-five metropolitan areas with a core Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure within the next decade.

DOT has chosen to apply available technology in communications and management to traffic, transit, and information problems suffered by commuters, instead of pursuing expensive science fiction scenarios to automate cars and roads à la Robert Heinlein's story *The Roads Must Roll*. Secretary Peña is to be commended for focusing on tools to help manage the current system, rather than costly and potentially destructive gimmickry.

Operation TimeSaver sets a measurable goal and commits to achieve that goal within a defined time frame. The announcement appropriately focused on the fact that investing in management and information technology to handle traffic and improve transit performance is more cost effective than adding new road capacity in metropolitan areas. Peña noted that equipping the Washington, D.C. region with the intelligent transportation infrastructure would cost \$300 million; about the cost of eight miles of urban freeway or one freeway to freeway interchange. ITS technologies need to be viewed as a cost effective alternative to building new roads. These technologies may also have a longer term impact, offering the potential for dynamic management of the transportation system in real time.

A new study being undertaken by STPP, the University of Minnesota's Humphrey Institute, and the Claremont Graduate School is exploring the potential of transportation technologies to contribute to a more sustainable future. Our project, *Transportation Technologies for Sustainable Communities*, is funded by the Minnesota DOT. The project proposes that ITS and communications technologies can help resolve the apparent conflict between the transportation system, its economic role, and its impact on society and the environment.

If transportation technologies are implemented in a way that embraces sustainability—defined as meeting today's needs in the areas of economy, social justice, and environment without sacrificing the ability of future generations to make the same choices—they can help us meet these goals and measure the impact of our transportation choices.

We can look forward to a future where we define desired levels of system performance in terms of accessibility and mobility; emissions and system condition; use technology to manage traffic and transit; and report on results to the taxpayer on a regular basis. Our study will use community focus groups as well as construct a scenario for sustainable technologies to build upon *Operation TimeSaver's* promise.

This issue of *Progress* examines the emerging ITS Infrastructure. The Humphrey Institute's Dave Van Hattum reports on our joint initiative, NRDC's Janet Hathaway looks at the potential for ITS to revolutionize transit performance, and STPP's Chris Bender suggests that ITS can improve safety and save money in rural areas as well as in the metropolitan areas emphasized in *Operation TimeSaver*.

**“Transportation and Information Technologies for Sustainable Technologies”
by Dave Van Hattum, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota**

In 1974, when Americans were still reeling from dramatic hikes in gasoline prices, who would have thought that the number of miles driven in the US would roughly double within two decades?

It wasn't that hard to imagine—that's what happened over the two previous decades. However, a major difference is that those same drivers increasingly started to run up against all sorts of limits.

Metropolitan areas started seeing their highways clog up sooner than predicted, generating greater levels of air pollution, reducing productivity, and creating new demands for ways to control all the new traffic problems.

Communities face a number of challenges related to transportation—noise and emissions from congestion; encroachment on open and civic spaces by urban sprawl; and inequitable access to employment and goods and services by low-income, elderly, and handicapped residents.

Communities are experimenting with a variety of new policies to address these concerns. At the same time, the emergence of new technologies may offer completely new approaches for communities in the future.

Technological innovation is critical to designing transportation systems that simultaneously promote economic growth, social equity and environmental protection. Equally important is an appropriate fit between new technologies and the needs of local communities.

A collaborative study, *Transportation Technologies for Sustainable Communities*, is underway by the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, the Claremont Graduate School, and Surface Transportation Policy Project. The Minnesota Department of Transportation and the ITS Joint Programs Office of the U.S. DOT funded this unique partnership. The study hopes to link technology development of intelligent transportation systems (ITS) and telecommunications with community defined priorities.

ITS refers to a wide range of information processing, communication control, and sensor technologies. ITS applications such as travel and transportation management, public transportation operations, and electronic payment are being developed through Federally funded operational tests across the nation.

ITS and telecommunication substitutes for travel offer the prospect of increasing the efficiency of the transportation system without further intruding upon neighborhoods, wildlife habitats, and open space.

Environmental organizations and others have raised concerns about the social and environmental impacts of ITS; and in particular the impact on transit use, social equity, and demand for travel. According to Tom Horan, Claremont Graduate School Institute for Applied Social and Policy Research Director, “this study can provide a policy architecture for deployment of ITS in communities seeking to maximize environmental gain.”

In framing transportation's contribution to sustainability, we define sustainable communities as human scaled and spatially defined communities that:

- a) consider the full social and environmental cost in the provision of resources and services;
- b) respect ecological carrying capacity; and
- c) balance the needs for greenspace, economic development, and access to resources.

Transportation Technology for Sustainable Communities has three major components:

- 1) a concept review defining key components of sustainable communities and transportation linkages;
- 2) focus groups and workshops with key transportation professionals, community stakeholders, and technology innovators; and
- 3) the development of sustainability indicators.

Research is taking place in Minnesota and nationally. The study is being integrated into Minnesota Guidestar's Polaris (Minnesota's ITS program) project whose objective is to develop a statewide ITS architecture. Architecture, as in "ITS architecture," refers to an overall system design that describes how ITS subsystems communicate with each other and are integrated to achieve overall strategic goals.

The next stage will be to engage community stakeholders, transportation planners, and policy makers in refining this framework and describing how emerging transportation/communication technologies could promote community sustainability. Using this framework, we hope to move from broad issues to guiding principles and indicators and, finally, to specific recommendations for the Minnesota Guidestar and Federal ITS programs.

The primary implication of the sustainability framework is that ITS should not be viewed strictly as a traffic management tool, but rather as an information source for overall system performance.

This perspective has important implications for developing a statewide architecture, achieving a balance of supply and demand side applications, initiating public-private partnerships, and devising public outreach strategies. For example, we recommend that emission management be investigated as a component of Minnesota's statewide ITS architecture. ITS traffic information services should be bundled with other information provided through the ever expanding telecommunication infrastructure. Finally, and most importantly, we are testing new public outreach techniques that address system-wide performance.

Planning for community input into the design of ITS and telecommunication systems to meet critical social, economic, and environmental goals provides an opportunity to operationalize transportation sustainability. The framework we are developing represents a starting point for ongoing communication between public and private sector ITS and telecommunications implementors; transportation, land use, and air quality plans; and community stakeholders.

If you would like a copy of the Humphrey Institute study, "ITS and the Environment: New Models for Federal, State and Local Cooperation," please contact Dave Van Hattum at 612.625.1017. Proceedings of a series of national conferences on ITS and the Environment and other related studies are available by calling Tom Horan at 909.621.8581.

Commuting for Better Transit
Janet S. Hathaway
Senior Attorney
Natural Resources Defense Council

Effective transit requires major economic and policy commitments, problematic in this era of scarce governmental resources. Today's information and communication technologies are cost-effective ways to enhance transit and shared-ride services.

Reliable transit is valuable. Travelers are most comfortable with transit which adheres to a predictable, known schedule, or when it is so frequent that a schedule is not needed to avoid long waits. Communication technologies can improve transit reliability.

A dynamic transit information service can provide accurate schedule information, updated to take into account traffic jams, construction delays, or weather related problems. Because it can be offered at a modest cost, most transit services offer only a printed schedule. It is more costly to provide passengers with up-to-date, "real-time" information about transit arrivals and departures, but that information is more valuable to riders. Travelers may access such information by telephone, personal computer, or interactive television, whether at home, work, or a public information kiosk. Travelers may reduce wait time by planning to arrive at the bus or train to coincide with arrival of the vehicle. The costs of such a service can be partially underwritten by subscriptions from business wishing to advertise through the service.

Traffic signalization giving transit priority can effectively increase travel speeds of buses and other roadway transit vehicles. Such systems can be operated manually by drivers. More sophisticated systems can operate automatically and vary the signal according to various traffic and roadway factors including the length of traffic queues, the levels of roadway congestion, and the need to make up time in order to meet the transit schedule.

Automatic vehicle location systems can help transit operate more efficiently and reliably. Management can rapidly identify vehicles falling behind schedule, and can assign additional vehicles to address routes with unusually high ridership.

An additional benefit of real-time vehicle location information is the ability to rapidly dispatch police, fire, or other emergency vehicles to assist the transit vehicle. Transit drivers in dangerous areas appreciate rapid response to silent alarms they can activate in the event of traffic accidents or threats to passenger safety.

Automated ride-matching services can facilitate the use of multiple passenger cars or vans. Ride-sharing is an alternative to single occupancy travel which has the potential to reduce environmental impacts while providing comfortable, affordable, and reliable transportation. Passengers may prefer ride-sharing to transit because it offers door-to-door service and a guaranteed seat. Ride-sharing networks allow both subscriptions for daily commute trips and requests for special or unique trips. Riders can read newspapers, make acquaintances, or just relax. The major impediment to ride-sharing is finding a "match" (and here, real-time information services become valuable).

A demand-responsive pick-up by a car or "jitney" is similar to ride-sharing in its passenger amenities but more like a taxi in guaranteeing pick-up upon demand. Jitneys, like ride-sharing, can be operated either privately or by a transit agency. Jitney services are likely to be cheaper to operate than conventional transit in low density areas, particularly during off-peak times. A jitney may increase transit use if it collects suburban travelers to deliver them to a rail station or major transit line. Jitneys may also be ideal for suburb-to-suburb travel, where ride-matches may be harder to make.

Technologies alone cannot solve our problems with air pollution, energy consumption, and resource depletion. But some technologies can serve us well in our quest to travel more efficiently, use less energy, and improve air quality.

This article has been excerpted from a paper, "Rides On Demand: Could This Be Transit?" For more information, please contact Janet Hathaway, Natural Resources Defense Council, 415.777.0220.

Technology Applications for Rural America
Christopher Bender
STTP Communications Coordinator

Transportation challenges vary significantly between rural and metropolitan areas. Congestion is probably the greatest challenge in our nation's cities, but in rural areas congestion is limited to a few specific spots or in conjunction with certain incidents.

Safety is the biggest challenge in rural areas. Rural roads account for 81 percent of public road mileage. Forty-one percent of vehicle miles traveled in the US are on rural roads, accounting for 61 percent of fatal accidents

The typical fix to rural safety challenges has been capacity expansion. In many states, the primary transportation plan consists of building four lane divided highways across rural America. This strategy does little to address the reasons for safety problems in rural areas. Most rural travel occurs in remote areas where the challenges of warning travelers about weather conditions, road conditions, or incidents are exacerbated. Nor does trying to build a solution with more or wider roads do much for assisting law enforcement and emergency services learn and react to incidents.

The application of technological measures to increase safety on rural roads could greatly effect the number of lives lost on our roadways.

Most of the attention focused on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) focuses on their application in urbanized areas to deal with congestion and traffic flow. However, we can utilize ITS in rural areas to meet the safety challenges of rural areas by providing information and communication services to travelers, law enforcement, and emergency services.

ITS offers an array of solutions that are more fiscally responsible, less destructive to the environment and communities, and likely to have greater positive impact with regards to safety than our current road-building credo.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is conducting a study to look at ITS rural applications with its Rural Advanced Traveler Information Systems (rural ATIS). Rural ATIS will provide an assessment of rural users' needs and develop a range of possible applications.

The study began with a national survey and focus groups to understand rural users needs. The study communicated with members of the general public, as well as police, EMS, highway, tourist, commercial operator, and travel organizations officials. Overwhelmingly, participants indicated that ITS applications should focus on information relating to problems that occur while traveling.

ITS can be used to develop mechanisms for notice of safe speeds due to weather conditions, incidents, road closures, geometric design, or congestion. Applications can be developed to lower the time necessary to contact EMS and for transport to medical facilities.

ITS can also be used to promote tourism and freight movement, and thus spur economic development. Rural areas can use technology to better manage their transportation needs and increase economic activity. All of this can be accomplished without increasing capacity or geometric designs.

Rural ATIS has developed a series of concepts in response to the identified needs of rural travelers from the focus groups and surveys. The concepts are categorized into three general areas: Emergency Response, Safety and Hazard Warning, and Traveler Services Information.

The Emergency Response concept includes initiatives for cellular, satellite, and CB radio mayday systems for emergency response.

The Safety and Hazard Warning concept includes warning systems for road conditions. An example is the Vehicle-Based Adaptive Safe Speed System which will present the driver with a recommended safe speed for given geometric conditions. The system uses information on vehicle weight, vehicle type, roadway geometry, and road surface conditions to recommend a safe speed. Static and dynamic roadway data will be combined with vehicle data in an on-board processor to compute the safe speed. The Roadside Safe Speed System will also use information on vehicle characteristics, roadway geometry, and road surface condition to recommend a safe speed. Static and dynamic roadway data will be combined with detected

vehicle characteristics and roadside processors, and a safe speed will be presented to the driver on a roadside changeable traffic sign.

Traveler Services Information provides travelers with navigation, traffic, and tourist information using in-vehicle and roadside technology.

Based on an evaluation of these concepts and recommendations from an expert advisory panel, a number of these concepts will be selected for further analysis. The analysis will include discussions of institutional, legal, and technical issues, national implications of each concept, and identification of possible applications sites.

For more information, on the Rural ATIS program, please contact Dave Warren, FHWA, 703.285.2426.

**Presentation
John C. Cox, Jr.
President,
Southern California Economic Partnership
Using Advanced Information,
Management, and Marketing Techniques to Increase the
Performance and Efficiency of the Surface Transportation System:
Representing a Private Sector Point of View**

Monday, December 16, 1996

21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium Linking Regional Planning & Operations for Effective ITS Deployment

As a backdrop to my comments, it seems appropriate to remind everyone of the principles formed recently by ITS America Reauthorization Task Force. In many ways, they reflect some of the common themes we have heard across the country.

ITS AMERICA ISTE A REAUTHORIZATION PRINCIPLES

1. Complete deployment of basic ITS passenger/freight services by 2005.
2. Support continued Research & Technology and emphasize system integration.
3. Maximize long-term predictability and stability.
4. Create maximum flexibility and allow for ITS training, operation, and maintenance.
5. Maintain regular reports on progress, performance, and effectiveness.
6. Encourage innovative financing techniques.
7. Eliminate deployment barriers and use innovative, flexible procurement methods.
8. Continue a targeted Federal role in public/private partnerships, rapid development of industry standards, markets, essential R&D, and insure interoperability by funding components which are consistent with the adopted model architecture and standards.

In order to put a fresh face on where we go from here, I believe it is very important to “to step out of the box” and look at the surface transportation system from a new perspective. Traditionally, transportation infrastructure has been considered “public service” public works projects. Over time, the surface transportation system has become somewhat more sophisticated through the use of strategic lane stripes, lane widening, ramp meters, or incident removal techniques to “channel” and “manage traffic flow.”

With the availability of today's sophisticated vehicle traffic detection, data collection/distribution systems, and the computerized management systems, we are now in the business of “processing” vehicles through a much more constrained vehicle distribution system. The operations, maintenance, management, and marketing of such a system requires fresh ways of addressing this new “customer service” business.

The question becomes, what methods should be used to plan, operate, maintain, manage, and market such a system. If, as suggested, the system now provides a “customer service,” then consumer marketing techniques must be considered to optimize service performance and consumer satisfaction. The following observations reflect some of the guiding principles and comments collected through private sector ITS discussions.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES:

- Deliver the underlying fundamental quality of life benefits of a sound, effective and efficient transportation system.
- Access to mobility.
- Access to Jobs.
- Economic Viability.
- Safe, Secure Environment.
- Service Convenience.
- Environmental (Air, Land, Water, Habitat) Protection.
- Use advanced information, management, and marketing techniques to increase the performance and efficiency of the surface transportation system.
- Provide strong Public Sector Leadership required to Champion and maintain the Vision of a "World Class" Transportation System.
- Consider the private operating Telecommunications Model as the means of providing the customer traveler information and system management.
- Maintain the public sector incentive funding to insure fundamental intermodal deployment, integration, and interoperability of the core intelligent transportation infrastructure.
- Use ongoing Consumer Market Research to collect valuable information and analytical data of customer use behavior and satisfaction with the transportation service so as to make informed investment, operating, management, and marketing decisions.
- Use Consumer Market Research to develop a better understanding of what impact Traveler Information and Telecommunications has on the Surface Transportation System.
- Encourage and facilitate national, regional, and local public/private partnership collaborations to insure effective interoperability.
- Modify Planning, Funding, Procurement, and Approval Processes so as to allow greater flexibility and quick response to market changes.
- Encourage and support training programs to insure a supply of skill labor.
- Support generic Industry Outreach and Education Marketing Programs that convey the quality of life benefits of a Smart "World Class" Transportation System.
- Leverage Market Forces to the advantage of surface transportation performance.
- Recognize "MARKET BASED" Private Sector marketing activity which has a transportation and air quality benefit but is not Required by Legislation, Regulation, Planned, Programmed as part of a SIP, or provided by the public sector. (A form of innovative financing).

- Use the strengths and expertise of various segments of the public and private sectors to maximize cost effective system deployment and operation.

The PUBLIC SECTOR - Understands the public policy and process necessary to build public works capital improvement projects:

- Provides the core infrastructure data collection system.
- Traffic Flow Detectors.
- Traffic Control Devices.
- Public Agency Transportation Information.

The PRIVATE SECTOR - Offers the skills and experience to operate, maintain, manage, and market a performance-based and efficient customer service delivery system:

- Provides traffic management, information system management.
- ATMS/ATIS could follow Telecommunications Model.
- The private sector understands the complexities of technology.
- The Market Forces
- The Economic Drivers
- The Customer Demands
- The Market Growth Factors
- The Returns on Investment
- The Standards Requirements
- The Regulatory Requirements
- The Systems Operations Requirements
- The Distribution Systems
- The Inter-Operability Requirements
- The Training Requirements
- The Marketing, Advertising, Outreach/Education Requirements
- The Asset Management Process
- The Asset Broker Function
- THEY RESPOND QUICKLY TO MARKET TRENDS
- THEY ARE BUILDING IT TODAY!

MARKET GROWTH INDICATORS

TRAVELER INFORMATION MARKET (in addition to existing Print/Broadcast Media)

- 750,000 In-vehicle navigation devices on Japan's roads today
- **10 percent of all Japan's new vehicles Navigation equipped in 1996**
- 20,000 Trucks currently use PrePass (automatic vehicle identification, weigh-in-motion sensors, vehicle-to-roadside communication) transponders in California, Arizona, and New Mexico.
- Big 3 and Japan automakers are setting port standards for plug-and-plan communications gear
- Every **major** auto industry player has Navigation device - GM, Ford, Chrysler, Toyota, Honda, Nissan, BMW, Mercedes, Delco, Donso, Sony, Siemens
- New MobileWeb controller/server will turn vehicle into rolling WEB Site providing applications from traffic conditions to delivery fleet truck tracking
- Worldwide Navigation sales expected to be \$2.5 Billion in 1998
- 30 percent of all new US vehicles expected to be equipped with turn-by-turn Navigation systems by 2000, 250,000 US Navigators sales per year by 2001
- **25 million Navigators on US roads by 2005;** 22 million In Japan (Will they have traffic content?)

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MARKET FORECAST

- **\$16.5 billion worldwide ATMS Equipment Market over 15 years**
- \$30.8 billion Commercial Fleet Management Systems
- \$7.1 billion Electronic Toll Collection Equipment
- \$1.8 billion Public Vehicle Transportation Management Systems
- \$0.4 billion Commercial Vehicle Operations ITS equipment

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

- 38.5 percent of all US households have 1 or more personal computers
- 67 percent of households with \$40,000+ income have PCs
- 30 percent of households with Less than \$30,000 income have PCs
- **53 percent of all US households will have a PC by 2001**
- 18 million US households have more than one phone line
- 11 percent annual growth in California second lines
- 144 percent growth in California ISDN.lines
- 15 million Internet Users in the US in 1996

TELECOMMUTING

- **45 million individuals operated home offices in 1995**
- **23 million Americans telecommuted in 1996**
- **2/3 of Fortune 1000 companies have telecommuting programs**
- About 8,000 home-based businesses are started daily
- 23 percent growth per year in "SOHOT" Market (Small Office/Home Office Telecommuters)
- 10 million messages a day are sent by E-mail
- 95 percent of US Companies with 1000+ employees will be connected to the Internet by 2000
- 1.5 million Internet Phone Products Shipped in 1996
- **Desktop Videoconferencing equipment sales to reach \$15 billion by 2000**
- For every 1,000 workers who telecommute, annual savings would be 121,667 gallons of gas, 11 tons of hydrocarbons, 3 tons of carbon monoxide and 4 tons of nitrogen oxide.

TELESERVICES

- 16 percent of US voice-traffic volume over Internet by 2000
- WEB Advertising Revenue to reach \$5 billion by 2000
- On-line investors have 1.5 million accounts
- Video Conference Lunches offered by Apple Cafe
- Pavilions Supermarkets offer ShoppingLink
- **40 percent of US Supermarket chains offer home shopping service**
- 80 percent of Chicago's Peapod shoppers use on-line grocery shopping services
- **Auto-By-Tel sold over 20,000 vehicles in August 1996**
- Amazon.Com of Seattle sells several thousand books a day online from 1.1 million book titles offered
- Online shoppers spent \$1.25 billion in 1996
- **20 percent of '97 Software Sales expect to use electronic distribution**
- A 2 hour movie will take 7 minutes to download by 2000

All of these intelligent transportation activities, including telecommunications applications, are having an impact on the transportation system. We don't know exactly how much. Market research in this area would give us better insights.

Some say "the technological revolution is in progress." The Intel computer on a chip technology has moved from a 0.06 MIPS system 25 years ago to a 300 MIPS 686 system today. The 1286 system is expected to operate at 100,000 MIPS in 15 years, another reminder that our transportation planning, implementation, and improvement programs must be extremely flexible to accommodate the rapid improvements in technology.

OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS

I. MARKET FORCES - "What are the key external and internal forces, trends and resources, barriers and opportunities, given the increased emphasis on operating and managing the existing transportation system more efficiently?"

A. EXTERNAL

1. CONSUMER DEMANDS

a. CONVENIENCE

- (1) Access
- (2) Time

b. SAFE TRAVEL CONDITIONS

- (1) Warning Systems
- (2) Collision Protection
- (3) Anti-Skid Braking Systems

c. INFORMATION

- (1) Directional Signage
- (2) Construction Warnings
- (3) Bus Routes/Schedules

d. AFFORDABLE DEVICES

- (1) Price Points - \$20/Month Info Service; \$500 Appliance; \$20,000 Auto
- (2) Easy to Use
- (3) Dependable
- (4) Low Maintenance

2. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CONCERNS
 - a. MARKET OPPORTUNITIES
 - b. RETURN ON INVESTMENT
 - c. COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT
 - d. MARKET RESPONSIVE
- B. INTERNAL (PUBLIC SECTOR)
 1. POLICY MAKER CONCERNS
 - a. SOCIAL/EQUITY ISSUES
 - b. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
 - c. BUDGET CONSTRAINTS
 - d. POLICY CONSTRAINTS
 - e. PROCESS REQUIREMENTS
 2. IMPLEMENTORS
 - a. DELIVER A PROJECT, NOT PERFORMANCE RESULTS
- C. TRENDS
 1. TECHNOLOGY
 - a. MORE OF IT
 - b. MORE EFFECTIVE
 - c. MORE AFFORDABLE
 - d. SHORTER LIFE CYCLES (18 Months to 5 Years)
- D. RESOURCES
 1. LABOR
 - a. General Shortage of Required Skills
 - b. Lack of Training
 2. FINANCIAL
 - a. Government Funds are Limited
 - b. ITS is not a Private Investment Market
- E. BARRIERS
 1. ITS IS A PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT
 2. LIMITED CORE INFRASTRUCTURE
 3. LIMITED COMMUNICATION STANDARDS AND PROTOCOLS
 4. LIMITED CONSUMER MARKET
 5. NO MARKETING EFFORT
- F. OPPORTUNITIES
 1. SEEDS HAVE BEEN PLANTED
 2. SOME CORE INFRASTRUCTURE IN PLACE
 3. SOME FUNDING AVAILABLE
 4. TECHNOLOGY AVAILABLE
 5. PRIVATE SECTOR POISED TO INVEST

II. PLANNING PROCESS - "What and how can changes in Planning Process (including definitions of "planning") accommodate regional systems management operations and integrated information systems?"

A. CURRENT SYSTEM BARRIERS

1. CONTRACTUAL CONSTRAINTS
2. TIMELY
3. LABORIOUS
4. PROCESS DOES NOT ACCOMMODATE NEW TECHNOLOGY
5. LACK OF TRAINED LABOR FORCE

B. OPPORTUNITIES

1. ADOPT CUSTOMER SERVICE MENTALITY
2. USE MARKETING TECHNIQUES
 - a. Track Market Penetration
 - b. Track Market Growth Potential
 - c. Monitor Performance & Effectiveness
3. USE DESIGN BUILD PROCESS
4. USE PROCESSING SYSTEM MODEL
5. USE PRIVATE SECTOR SPECIALITIES
6. STIMULATE TARGET MARKET GROWTH
7. ACCOMMODATE MARKETING REQUIREMENTS
8. RECOGNIZE "MARKET BASED" ACTIVITIES

III. INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES - "What institutional and organizational barriers exist that prevent the inclusion of operations in the planning process? What are the key activities and related institutional characteristics and capabilities required in terms of roles, relations, organization, staffing (public and private), etc., to deploy and manage/operate an information-intensive system; to improve operation of roadway transit services; and to improve operations of the agencies?"

A. LACK OF SOLID VISION

1. PROVIDE A "WORLD CLASS" OR "BEST OF CLASS" SYSTEM
2. DIFFERENT OPERATING STYLES
3. PUBLIC SECTOR - PUBLIC SERVICE
4. PRIVATE SECTOR - CUSTOMER SERVICE

B. RESPONSIBILITIES

1. PUBLIC SECTOR - BY THE BOOK PROCESS PROJECT DELIVERABLE
2. PRIVATE SECTOR - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION/RETURN ON INVESTMENT

C. NEW LEVELS OF SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

1. PUBLIC WORKS MANAGEMENT
2. PRIVATE SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

D. TECHNICAL HURDLES

1. STANDARDS
2. INTEROPERABILITY
3. TRAINING
4. OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

IV. INFORMATION SYSTEM ROLES - "What are the roles of various information systems (particularly the ITS, the GIS, and the Transportation Management Systems - CMS, IMS, etc.) in improving roadway and transit systems performance and the operations of various agencies? In what ways can new technologies, systems concepts, and enterprises enable new levels of systems management? What are the major technical and institutional hurdles?"

A. INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

1. SAFER VEHICLES
2. INCIDENT REDUCTION

B. GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (GIS)

1. LAND USE CONDITIONS
2. LANDMARKS
3. DIRECTIONAL ASSISTANCE

C. TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (TMS)

1. TRAFFIC FLOW EFFICIENCY

V. URBAN FORM, LAND USE, ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OF LIFE

A. "WHAT TRENDS ARE PERTINENT TO PROVIDE INFORMATION-BASED TRANSPORTATION?"

1. ON-LINE/INTERNET MARKET GROWTH

"DOES INFORMATION REDUCE TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENT EXTERNALITIES?"

2. YES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION PROVIDE MORE MODE CHOICE, ROUTE DEVIATION, AND TIME OF TRAVEL

B. "WHAT ARE MARKET, INSTITUTIONAL, AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS?"

1. A better educated consumer, customer, decision maker

VI. POLICY ISSUES - "What are the policy implications of information-based transportation at both the Federal and State level? What specific issues (barriers, opportunities) need to be addressed before information technologies, systems, and enterprises can deliver maximum benefits? What policy instruments are most appropriate: legislation, regulation, financial incentives, model arrangements, etc.? What are the likely effects of the National Information Infrastructure (NII) and the new telecommunications law on the regional transportation planning process?"

A. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

1. SELLING PUBLIC DATA
2. NOT GIVING AWAY POTENTIAL REVENUE STREAMS
3. ALLOWING PRIVATE SECTOR OPERATORS

B. WHAT WILL DELIVER MAXIMUM BENEFITS?

1. ADOPTING INTEROPERABILITY STANDARDS
2. USING PRIVATE SECTOR OPERATORS
3. PROVIDING SEED FUNDING TO GROW MARKETS

C. APPROPRIATE POLICY INSTRUMENTS - USE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. LEGISLATION
2. REGULATION
3. FINANCIAL INCENTIVES
4. MODEL ARRANGEMENTS

VII. **RESEARCH GAPS - "What research gaps exist that relate to information-intensive transportation technical, institutional/financial, and organizational arrangements, particularly with respect to transportation planning, programming, operations, and management?"**

- A. INFORMATION EFFECTIVENESS
 - 1. TRAVELER INFORMATION IMPACT ON SYSTEM
 - a. Newspaper Pre-trip Reports
 - b. Television Pre-trip Reports
 - c. Radio In-route Reports
- B. TECHNICAL
 - 1. GREEN TIME CONTROL
 - 2. TRAFFIC DETECTOR PENETRATION
 - 3. INTEROPERABILITY EFFECTIVENESS
- C. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
 - 1. THE MISSION
 - 2. OPERATING CULTURE
 - 3. SKILLED MANAGEMENT STAFF
 - 4. SKILLED OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE STAFF
- D. OPERATIONAL
 - 1. SKILL-LEVELS AVAILABILITY
 - 2. TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
- E. FINANCIAL
 - 1. RETURN ON INVESTMENT
 - 2. IDENTIFYING NON-PUBLIC REVENUE STREAMS
 - 3. PRIVATE SECTOR INTEREST (NOT A “MARKET” YET)

SUMMARY

Completing the deployment of the core ITS infrastructure continues to be a basic objective in order to deliver the underlying fundamental quality of life benefits of a sound, effective, and efficient transportation system.

A continued targeted Federal role in public/private partnerships to stimulate rapid development of industry standards, markets, essential R&D; funding components which are consistent with the adopted model architecture and standards; and facilitate national, regional and local public/private partnership collaborations is essential to insure interoperability and demonstrate the strong Federal leadership required to Champion and maintain the Vision of a "World Class" Transportation System and maximizes long-term predictability and stability.

Using the strengths and expertise of various segments of the public and private sectors and the operation, advanced information, management, and marketing techniques will increase the performance and efficiency of the surface transportation system.

Eliminate deployment barriers, modify Planning, Funding, Procurement, and Approval Processes, and use innovative, flexible procurement methods to produce greater flexibility and quick response to market changes.

Use Consumer Market Research to collect valuable information and analytical data to:

- Determine customer use behavior and satisfaction with the transportation service, so as to make informed investment, operating, management, and marketing decisions.
- Develop a better understanding of what impact traveler information and telecommunications has on the surface transportation system.

Support generic Industry Outreach and Education Marketing Programs that convey the quality of life benefits of a Smart "World Class" Transportation System and training programs to insure a supply of skilled labor.

Recognize "MARKET BASED" Private Sector marketing activity which has a transportation and air quality benefit but is not Required by Legislation, Regulation, Planned, Programmed as part of a SIP, or provided by the public sector. (A form of innovative financing).

The Federal-Aid surface transportation programs should produce opportunities to plant more seeds, stimulate, and leverage the market forces. These strategies are of paramount importance to the effectiveness of our future surface transportation system.

Today, roughly 98 percent of all US households have a television set in their home. Will 98 percent have access to real-time intermodal transportation information by 2005?

SPECIAL VOLPE CENTER RESEARCH SESSION

"Identify Research Needs Associated with Information-Intensive Transportation" DOT Round table: Macro Trends & Research Developments

GUIDING QUESTIONS *Answers by John C. Cox, Jr*

1) QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUES

- How would free and perfect transportation-related information affect lifestyle and market decisions and how might these decisions, in turn, affect the environment, land use patterns, urban form, and the overall quality of life in communities?

ANSWER: *In the first place, nothing is free or perfect. More important, information in of itself does not make a market. Marketing communications certainly is a very important component for product/service awareness and influences use. Many factors influence choices or preferences. It would take a very expensive information campaign supported by extensive scientific research to influence significant quality of life issues. The anti-smoking campaign is a prime example.*

2) TRANSPORTATION/COMMUNICATIONS

- To what degree is transportation becoming a sub-branch of the broader sector encompassing information-intensive transportation and communications services?

ANSWER: *Telecommunications is a sub-branch of Transportation and vice versa. Regardless of how they are positioned, telecommunications has become a significant transportation mode representing a 5 to 20 percent share of market.*

3) INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- What institutional issues does the shift to information-intensive transportation raise, and what new institutional arrangements could facilitate the use of information technologies to maximize the benefits to local communities?

ANSWER: *It means shifting the transportation information component responsibility to the private sector. They are much better trained and equipped to respond to the service demands of the customer.*

4) PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- Do information and communications technologies provide opportunities for improved public involvement in the transportation decision-making process?

ANSWER: *No. From a public participation standpoint, not any more than the televised public meetings.
Yes. If true, consumer market research is used as the means of gathering consumer attitude, behavior, and purchase or use intents. Yes. From a consumer use standpoint, better information and communications provides the user the greater opportunity to [make] better travel decisions.*

- Are new public involvement processes needed to exploit these opportunities, and what are the potential pitfalls?

ANSWER: *No. There is no better test of consumer acceptance than product or service use. If the product and services are available, the customers will be involved and will provide significant feedback. We need to be able to collect, track and analyze that data as accurately as possible.*

5) PLANNERS/OPERATORS

- How can transportation professionals (e.g., planners, operators) harness new technologies to improve the performance of the transportation system and, in doing so, address the broad economic, social, and environmental concerns expressed by communities?

ANSWER: *Transportation professionals must understand and insure the technological deployment requirements of the transportation and telecommunications core infrastructure if they are going to provide the quality of life benefits of a safe, secure, mobile, information accessible, and economically sound community. They must become educated on the use of advanced technologies and modify their habits to recognize and use the major role the private sector plays in technology performance and effectiveness.*

Planning Breakout Session Notes

Gary Ritter
Session Leader

Monday, December 16, 1996

December 16, 1996, Planning Breakout Session Notes

21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Symposium:

Linking Regional Planning and Operation for Effective ITS Deployment

The session was chaired by Gary Ritter, Volpe Center ITS Program Coordinator, who was assisted by Susan Grosser, Federal Transit Administration, in capturing major discussion points, and by Ken Tersero, the official session recorder. The breakout session addressed two general questions and two specific questions as indicated below. The summary notes provided herein were taken by the session Chair and have not been compared or reconciled with other accounts of the discussion, including the subsequent report to the plenary session regarding breakout session deliberations, and so may contain additional or conflicting information.

General Question A: Given the increased emphasis on operating and managing the existing surface transportation system more efficiently, as opposed to increasing systems capacity through major capital investments, what are the key factors (external and internal forces, barriers, opportunities) to be considered?

- ITS/ITI lacks a "rallying slogan" or "imperative" comparable to "get the farmer out of the mud." Saving time, while important to travelers, does not resonate with public officials and planning staff responsible for highway and transit facilities.
- The planning focus is on TIPs and SIPs and how to apply Federal funding to alleviate existing or anticipated operational problems through major capital improvements to regional highway and transit systems, and less so on how to use technology to enhance day-to-day operations.
- Systems management has yet to take root as an integral regional planning function (as opposed to a TSM-like "add-on"). Management is a difficult "sell" to the public, even though the lack of travel predictability is irksome to most. Existing system performance measures for use by planners are inadequate for assessing and expressing the benefits of ITS strategies.
- Given that ITS can be applied in many different ways, it is difficult to explain to decision makers what ITS is and isn't in the absence of a particular deployment or application concept that would yield a particular result.
- Special Federal funding is needed to "promote" ITS. The number one barrier is dollars. State and local agencies perceive ITS as a new thrust over and above existing activities, therefore it should provide new or supplemental funding to cover the additional cost of ITS. And, most elected officials have a comparatively short time horizon.
- Avoiding the appearance of a Federal mandate, especially in the absence of Federal funding, is critical for success.

- ITS can be a constructive "agent of change" for achieving greater cooperation among regional transportation agencies.

General Question B: With respect to transportation planning, programming, operations, and management for information-intensive transportation, what research gaps exist, and what kinds of studies, research, and operational tests are most promising (technical, institutional, financial, organizational/staffing)?

- Early Deployment Planning, Priority Corridors, Operational Tests, and the Model Deployment Initiative have been helpful in stimulating and forging interagency working relationships among planners and operators within regions. "New" funding (so that pre-existing agency-specific funding commitments are not placed at risk) and flexibility on how it can be used would be helpful in getting agencies to work together.
- Ways to use ITS to promote the "I" in ISTEA are needed. Research is needed to discover how ITS concepts can be applied to reduce inefficiencies at intermodal interfaces. The benefits of ITS need to be demonstrated convincingly in real world applications, and widely publicized.
- Research is needed to establish under what circumstances it would be advantageous for public agencies to function as traffic / transit information producers vs. consumers (i.e., the extent to which needs can be met cost-effectively by commercial offerings or shared capabilities).
- Support in the development of more advanced transportation modeling tools for ITS analysis, especially relative to air quality conformity determinations.
- Investigations into how ITS-generated data and information can be used as a rich source of transportation planning data should be a priority.

Planning Breakout Question 1: What changes in the planning and programming process are desirable to accommodate regional systems management, operations, and integrated information systems?

- Planning is still largely unimodal, however, this is unlikely to change given modally-oriented Federal deployment funding programs.
- Attain national consensus on a few ITS/ITI basics that focus on "deploying" something. This will help get away from the notion of ITS as a multi-purpose "enabler," and avoid the confusion that arises when everyone has a different idea of what ITS is (i.e., is ITS for capacity and efficiency, for environmental enhancement, or both? If both, how much of each?).
- The ITS transportation planning process needs to be more aware of and suitably coordinated with public sector communications infrastructure planning activities, including but not limited to the activities of established state telecommunications agencies.
- A dynamic planning process is needed to address regional ITS integration and operation issues between public sector agencies and private sector providers. It was noted that planning makes sure that "lanes meet" across boundaries, and the same is needed for traffic management and operations. A requirement for planning and operations people within a region to work together was offered as one suggestion.

- Given the anticipated private sector financial contributions to ITS deployment (80 percent) overall, new mechanisms for planning public infrastructure investment needed to stimulate private initiatives are needed. Planning as usual won't do. Accelerated public sector planning and deployment processes are needed.

Planning Breakout Question 2: What is required in terms of activities, roles, relations, organization, staffing (public and private), etc., to deploy and manage/operate an information-intensive system which improves operation of the roadway and transit service?

- Technical staff at the larger MPOs are fairly familiar with ITS in concept. This is less so with regard to smaller MPO member agencies and the elected officials who govern the MPO. These people need to be educated on the benefits of ITS in light of competing imperatives they may perceive relative to available funding. MPO staff can serve as a first line "educator" but needs to have suitable educational materials to illustrate the benefits and advantages of choosing ITS.
- Considerable differences concerning transportation improvement priorities often exists within major metropolitan areas. MPO staff must be able to address the distributional aspects of ITS benefits; among and between central city and suburban or among various modal interests, for instance. Incentives and organizational mechanisms are needed to promote "regional" planning and deployment rather than merely "regional coordination" of jurisdictional efforts.
- There needs to be a recognition among the requisite parties that transportation system operation and management planning is a topic of regional and intermodal scope and transcends single agency jurisdictions. Federal leadership is needed to help state and local transportation staffs and officials approach transportation systematically rather than focusing on the individual parts (i.e., NAS, STP, transit, etc.), so that when regional transportation issues are considered the discussion is not just about "how the pork is sliced and passed out."
- ITS should not become the tail wagging the transportation dog. It needs to be recognized that transportation is a means to an end not an end in itself and that transportation systems need to be considered in the context of urban systems (housing, economic development, education, public safety, etc.) overall.
- A new funding stream for an ITS regional operating authority would be needed. However, it was not at all evident that such regional authorities are preferred over greater inter-agency cooperation and partnership with the private sector.
- The ITS scanning reviews should be made a routine activity, not something special.

A concerted ITS planning activity is needed. One in which goals, deployment objectives, and ITS Architecture decisions are cascaded in a coordinated, interwoven fashion from the Federal, to State and local governments. A starting point is to achieve more effective transfer of the National ITS Architecture findings and conclusions to State and local agencies so that they can take the next steps in adopting regionalized versions.

Information Systems Breakout Report
Thomas O. Mottl
Session Leader

Monday, December 16, 1996

December 16, 1996
Information Systems Breakout

Thomas O. Mottl, Session Leader

Participants in the Information Systems Breakout identified the following as key factors to be considered in operating and managing surface transportation systems more effectively and efficiently:

- A broad system perspective in planning and making decisions.
- User needs and communicating ITS value and benefits to the customer.
- Teamwork and partnerships (ownership) which cut across project phases and requirements (cross-function) and organizations (cross-culture).
- Public policies which stimulate and support the above three factors.

These factors reflect the increasing need for transportation operating agencies to deal with issues related to services, products, customers, and partnerships rather than narrowly "design and build" projects. Thinking in terms of systems and communicating proactively, both vertically and horizontally, were central themes throughout the Information Systems Breakout Session. Public policies to promote and facilitate related activities both between the public and private sectors and between public agencies at various levels were highlighted as especially important.

Lack of easily perceived "tangibility" in benefits obtained from information systems used in surface transportation operations is considered a key issue in building the political and public consensus necessary to gain budget "clout" necessary to deploy and support them. Feedback on "pothole repairs" near someone's business or house or in a heavily traveled roadway was contrasted with feedback on improved average intersection transit times (obtained through better traffic monitoring and signal light timing) as an example of this issue. Raising awareness and visibility of public benefits of ITS in general was cited as a critical issue for motivating and sustaining spending on information systems for transportation infrastructure development and related operations and maintenance.

The issue of what roles information systems might play in improving roadway and transit systems performance and the operations of various agencies were considered at two levels. In terms of top level system concepts, comments indicated that activities such as the National Information Infrastructure (NII) initiative seemed to have little relevance to transportation and ITS in particular. Further discussion indicated that this was partly due to the fact that there is (in the view of session participants) no clear picture or understanding of what the NII was, what it would do, or how it "connects" with ITS. The opinion was also expressed that there already is enough "complexity" in ITS concepts without becoming involved with the even more abstract NII ideas. It also seemed to participants that the NII was focused on "ultimate high-

tech solutions."

On more immediate operational levels, such as operational traffic and traveler information systems, key questions, interests, and concerns centered on functional, operational, and policy issues, not technical. An example was the generally held view that policies of state DOT agencies typically avoid telling drivers what to do, but rather focus on making information available to the driver for individual decisions and choices. (This was contrasted with transit agency operations, where directing the traveler is accepted policy.) Under such policy restrictions, variable message sign investments could lose out to alternative capital needs, limiting ITS operational effectiveness. Discussion of other similar issues seemed to raise the question, "What is the 'business model' for state operated ITS systems?" Information systems carry the connotation of products, services, and customers. To design, build, and operate such systems successfully requires a clear and consistent notion of what business you are in, want to be in, or can be informed with. Is a classical business model which involves developing a product and selling it to a customer appropriate for and consistent with State-owned and -operated ITS under current policies and regulations?

Discussion of GIS (Geographic Information Systems) applications seemed to indicate that from an information systems standpoint, GIS technology is "lifeblood" for MPO operations and planning. This view seems to stem from the basic functionality of a GIS that is a multidimensional computerized data base with user-friendly geographic or other kinds of graphical map interfaces. These systems are reported to be very flexible, broadly applicable, and easy to use, and appeal to a lot of different interests and needs.

The final area in which information systems impacts were considered was education, training, and system performance assessments. The nature of the computer, telecommunications, and information appliances associated with ITS creates a natural environment for education and training. While the actual events of a transportation scenario are transient, with information technology these events can be captured and stored for reuse in a variety of ways related to education and training. Applications could include operator training and education, more general professional capacity building, or public relations. In addition, information captured by ITS information systems provides the means for measuring overall system performance. Absent such performance assessment capability, it would be very difficult to justify ITS investments and expenditures in competition with other conventional, more visible and easily understood transportation expenditures.

In terms of barriers and opportunities related to obtaining maximum benefits from information technologies, systems, and enterprises, elimination or changes to legislative and political barriers which restrict or preclude communication, collaboration, and partnerships was felt to be critical. State codes often create barriers in the design, procurement, and management of the high-tech systems required for ITS, including use of new types of professionals such as the "systems engineer." Identifying the real needs and functionality required of ITS, which is by nature cross-jurisdictional, is vital for cost effective design and the ultimate utility of such systems. Communication, cooperation, and collaboration among local government agencies is key in this regard, and a variety of barriers to these processes exists, both formal and informal. In this regard, a key need is to develop understanding of how to educate and "sell" key policy makers to remove these barriers.

A specific policy area of importance to successful deployment of ITS systems which was discussed briefly is that of telecommunications. Creation of linked transportation and telecommunication policies which recognize the close ties between these two areas was judged to be essential to realizing effective and efficient ITS operations.

Finally, on the question of what research gaps exist and what types of studies, research, and/or operational tests are most needed, three specific areas were discussed. First, the impact of information systems on travelers was an area of great interest and uncertainty, and viewed as appropriate to classical research methodologies. A more difficult and complex but related research issue is the overall affect on ITS performance of a reactive driver or traveler receiving continuous, real-time operational information.

In general it was felt that conventional "research" was not of primary importance to successful operations and management of surface transportation systems. However, research in the form of pilot studies was felt to be useful and was advocated by the group. In particular, it was felt that such research could result in better understanding of local jurisdictional issues based on determining "customer" wants and needs. In this context, GIS systems were promoted as key research tools for such studies because of their natural "fit" with the problems and their ability to graphically represent results in user-friendly formats meaningful to those at the local level.

On a related topic, it was the consensus of the group that consolidating results from all pilot studies and conducting ongoing assessments was especially important to developing meaningful, stable understanding of a wide range of ITS issues from technical to human factors to market acceptance. The difficulty of obtaining separate funding for such work after pilot studies are concluded led to the suggestion that such efforts be mandated by Federal agencies, and an incremental line item included in all ITS pilot programs to support them. Such funding would guarantee that comprehensive data bases were developed and timely assessment results available to guide future development and deployment decisions.

The Information Systems Breakout Session concluded with a spirited discussion on the importance to ITS deployments of vertical and horizontal communication, and the significance of the Internet in enabling such communication. The consensus of the group was that virtually all State DOT's and Federal transportation agencies have significant communications networking infrastructure in place today in the form of web sites and e-mail. However, discussion indicated that while these networking tools provide a basis for building bridges between organizations and facilitating communication between people with varying responsibilities and interests, there is growing organizational concern over their misuse in the course of day-to-day business. As a result, firewalls are reportedly being built to control or limit e-mail capabilities. The consensus was that such action would lead to lost opportunity in terms of the investment required, restrictions on desirable networking and information exchange between individuals and organizations, and create organizational morale issues. However, it was remarked by several participants that not infrequently the response to such restrictions was for individuals to go around firewall barriers by subscribing on an individual basis to on-line services.

**Presentation
Gene Ofstead
Assistant Commissioner, Minnesota DOT
Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges**

Tuesday, December 17, 1996

4 Stages

- Beginning
- Maintaining/Growing/Accelerating
- Taking the Discontinuous Step (break-through)
- Moving to Level 2 Technology

Stage 2 —Key Issue

Maintaining/Growing/Accelerating

- Resources
- Expanding Participation Beyond the Usual
- Keeping a High Profile (*especially internal*)
- Supporting Chaos (*creating awareness*)
 - State ITS Chapter
 - University Researchers
 - CVO/Safety/Travel Information Services

Stage 3 — Key Issues

The Discontinuous Step

- Commitment of Partners
 - Outcomes Focus
 - Really Sharing Control
 - Synergy Through Trust
- Unconventional Taxing (*product sales as capital source*)
- Organizing to Implement New Thinking
(*Put new wine in new wine skins*)

OUR CURRENT STRUGGLE

(From Stage 2 to Stage 3)

- Gaining Trust for New Alliances
- Reorganizing for Next Step
 - Right people
 - Acceptance from the Established Organizations
- Estimating Growth of Product Markets
- Public Acceptance of New Ways

figure cut and paste

**Presentation
Ginger Gherardi
Executive Director, Ventura County Transportation Commission
Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges**

Tuesday, December 17, 1996

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

- . NO SUCH THING AS “ULTIMATE SYSTEM”**
- . WHAT WE DO TODAY IS DISPOSABLE - SHORT TERM**
- . PROVIDE FOR FUTURE TECHNOLOGY -
INCORPORATE CONCEPT ONLY INTO
LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**
- . ITS ARE “LIFESTYLE TOOLS” - WAYS OF
THINKING/ACTING/MANAGING/OPERATING -
ALL AROUND US PART OF DAY TO DAY
CHORES.**

IMPLEMENTATION

- **LEARN HOW TO COMMUNICATE IN PLAIN ENGLISH!**
NEVER, NEVER USE WORDS LIKE:

**ITS, ITI, SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE,
PROTOCOLS, ETC.**

ALWAYS USE WORDS LIKE:

**NEW, BETTER, HIGH TECH, CUTTING EDGE
- STIR IMAGINATION, MARKET CONCEPTS.**

- **DON'T TRY TO BE TOO GLOBAL! HAVE A CLEAR
VISION OF WHAT YOU WANT TO ACCOMPLISH**
- **BE OPEN TO OPPORTUNITIES**

IMPLEMENTATION (CONTINUED)

- . DON'T BE AFRAID TO TRY SOMETHING NEW -
CONSIDER IT A WORK IN PROGRESS!**
- . IMPLEMENT SMALL USABLE PROJECTS WITH
CLEAR PUBLIC BENEFIT, EASY TO IMPLEMENT.**
- . SUCCESS & SUPPORT MEASURED BY PUBLIC IN
PERCEIVED PERSONAL BENEFIT &
CONVENIENCE**

VCTC- 3 IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS (2 MORE IN PLANNING)

- 1. ON-LINE TRANSIT ROUTING - ALL SO.
CALIFORNIA, EXCEPT SAN DIEGO
COST - \$60,000 STATE TDM
IMPLEMENTATION - 3 MOS.**

IMPLEMENTATION (CONTINUED)

2. COUNTYWIDE PASSPORT - RF SMART CARD COST - THROUGH

VOLPE/CALTRANS \$150,000

LOCAL 70 BUSES - 10 SYSTEMS-GOOD

PLANNING REPORTS - 2+ YEARS

**TO IMPLEMENT - PUBLIC CONVENIENCE -
MO. PASS -DEBIT**

3. TTY DEVICES FOR CALL BOXES - DESIGNED, MANUFACTURED BY PRIVATE SECTOR - COMPETITIVE BID - 0 LOCAL COST. BEING INSTALLED NOW - CHANGED 911 DISPATCHING 1 INFORMATION FOR CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY POLICE.

TRANSIT ISSUES

- **OPERATIONAL COSTS, NOT TREATED SAME WAY AS HIGHWAYS - NEED TO MODIFY OR CLARIFY FUNDING STRUCTURE TO PERMIT OPERATIONAL, MAINTENANCE COSTS OF ITS SYSTEMS THAT CROSS OPERATORS. NEED TO MEASURE LONG TERM PLANNING BENEFITS & SAVINGS.**
- **NEED OPERATIONAL TEST TO CROSS MODES/RAIL/BUS/ROADS**

REALITY? OR JUST “ISSUES”

- I. THE NATIONAL CULTURE “THING”
(OUR GENERIC WAY OF LIFE)**
- II. LACK OF “STRUCTURES” TO DEAL WITH LARGE
ISSUES**
- III. MAJOR PRIVATE SECTOR ISSUES ARE SIMILAR
TO GOVERNMENT ISSUES (TRANSIT vs.
FREIGHT)**
- IV. THE GOVERNMENT GAP BETWEEN
OPERATIONS & STRATEGIC INITIATIVES IS
LARGE (TRB #249)**
- V. THE TIME GAP FOR GOVERNMENT PROCESS vs.
PRIVATE PROCESS IS A BIG PROBLEM**
- VI. PLANNING MAY NOT BE THE ISSUE OR
SOLUTION**

MOVING FORWARD

- 1. LOOK AT WHAT IS WORKING (i.e., OTHER MODELS)**
- 2. CLOSING THE TIME GAP
VISION STRATEGY BUSINESS PLANS
- LET THE QUICKEST LEAD**
- 3. PICK TARGETS (MARKET DRIVEN LINES)
- MIRTS
OTHER “NON-GOVERNMENT” OPPORTUNITIES**
- 4. DON’T GET MIRED DOWN
- KEEP DOING “STUFF”
- USE CHAOS AS AN OPPORTUNITY**
- 5. CONTINUE TO SEE ITS AS A LEVER FOR MAJOR INSTITUTION**
- 6. SUPPORT BELLWETHER EFFORTS**

Presentation
Les Jacobson
Traffic Services Manager, Washington DOT
Panel Discussion of State and Local Challenges

Tuesday, December 17, 1996

ITS PLANNING

FEDERAL ROLE - STRONG LEADERSHIP

1. NATIONAL DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

- DRAWN FROM STATE/REGIONAL DEPLOYMENT PLANS**
- SELECT INITIAL SYSTEMS**

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

- ENGAGE PRIVATE SECTOR**

BUILDS PUBLIC SECTOR

BUILDS USER PRODUCTS

2. STATE DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

3. REGIONAL DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

- INCLUDES ITS IN RTP**

PATH TO DEPLOYMENT

FEDERAL PROGRAM (FUNDING)

- 1. RESEARCH & TESTING (200 M)**
 - 2. INTEGRATED DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVE
(200 M)**
 - NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT**
 - 3. DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVE (1B+)**
 - ENABLES STATES/REGIONS TO BUILD
NATIONAL ITS ELEMENTS**
 - PROVIDES INCENTIVES TO STATE TO
BUILD STATE ELEMENTS**
-
- USE MATCH REQUIREMENT = INCENTIVE**

ITS PLANNING

FEDERAL ROLE - STRONG LEADERSHIP

1. NATIONAL DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

- **DRAWN FROM STATE/REGION
DEPLOYMENT PLANS**
- **SELECT INITIAL SYSTEMS NATIONAL
HIGH WAY SYSTEMS**
- **ENGAGE PRIVATE SECTOR**

BUILDS PUBLIC SECTOR

BUILDS USER PRODUCTS

2. STATE DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

3. REGIONAL DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

- **INCLUDES ITS IN RTP**

PATH TO DEPLOYMENT

FEDERAL PROGRAM (FUNDING)

- 1. RESEARCH & TESTING (200 M)**
- 2. INTEGRATED DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVE (200M)**
- 3. DEPLOYMENT INCENTIVE (1B+)**
 - ENABLES STATES/REGIONS TO BUILD NATIONAL ITS ELEMENTS**
 - PROVIDES INCENTIVES TO STATE ELEMENTS**

USE MATCH REQ = INCENTIVE

LINKING PLANNING & OPERATIONS

CHALLENGES:

- **VIEW ITS AS TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT,
NOT SEPARATE PROGRAM**
- **COLLABORATION:**

**ROLES APPROPRIATE FOR ALL
ORGANIZATIONS**

- ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST


- **REGIONAL (NATIONAL) SYSTEMS THAT
PRESERVE LOCAL DETERMINATION**
- **PERFORMANCE MONITORING &
EVALUATION**
- **FLEXIBILITY OF APPROACH**

LOCAL/REGIONAL UNIQUENESS

LEAD/RESPOND TO TRENDS

MIGRATE TO MATURE MODEL(S)

LINKING PLANNING & OPERATIONS (CONTINUED)



21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Comments
Sigmund Silber

Monday, December 16, 1996

NOTE: Mr. Sigmund Silber attended the two day symposium. Mr. Silber provided the following comments to the Office of T and ITS Applications, Federal Highway Administration after the symposium.

21st Century Transportation Infrastructure Comments

After sitting through a very stimulating two days, I wish to focus my comments in three areas:

- The disconnect between the planning frameworks we have established and the way people in the field think.
- The problem which is emerging with the rubric: “ITS”
- A need for additional scenario planning tools.

DISCONNECT RE PLANNING FRAMEWORKS

U.S. DOT has spent a lot of time and effort developing certain planning frameworks. These include but are not limited to the Goals/Objectives/Strategies benefit analysis framework which is in the National Program Plan and a number of frameworks resulting from the National Architecture Project including the Market Packages framework and the cost analysis methodology which is close to being a tool that implementors can use.

Both during the plenary and breakout sessions, I found little if any awareness of any of these planning frameworks. If such frameworks were understood and accepted, we wouldn't be having conversations on how should we look at ITS and how the National Architecture relates to what is going on in each community.

There are a number of possibilities. One is that we have just not done enough to disseminate the information on these planning frameworks. A second possibility is that these planning frameworks are not useful or usable in that they do not mesh with either the way implementors think or the way they need to assemble information in order to get project approved. Either way, this is a problem that might usefully be addressed.

My suggestion would be to use a case study approach to work with one or two MPOs and perhaps State DOT's to see that they know about these frameworks and how they would feel about using them.

Frameworks provide a language for communication. If we are not all speaking the same language, there will always be difficulties in communicating.

PROBLEMS WITH THE ITS RUBRIC

Many at this two-day meeting made the valid point that ITS is not separate from the other things they are doing. Of course, systems built today will use information technology.

Rather than focusing on ITS being something that is very different from previous transportation solutions, it might be better to focus on the way that utilizing information technology provides new options to planners. A framework that I am experimenting with is as follows, and others might find it useful.

We can look at Information-Intensive Transportation (IITS) as allowing new types of integration/interconnections/interaction including:

- *Between travelers and the transportation infrastructure (in a multi-modal context) as well as agents of the transportation infrastructure (e.g., ISP's).
- *Between travelers and businesses serving travelers. Clearly this will result in increased economic activity and a decreased importance of these businesses being located where they are visible from the highway.
- *Between the driver/vehicle team and the transportation infrastructure (including agents of the transportation infrastructure). Much of this communication today is between the infrastructure and the driver, but increased vehicle to infrastructure interconnectivity is likely.
- *Among transportation infrastructure systems including systems operated by different institutional entities and systems associated with differing transportation modes. This is an area which is very conducive to synergy. The interconnection of pockets of functionality produces entirely new capabilities.
- *Between and among the various subsystems within the vehicle. This may be seen as totally the province of the automotive companies, but this is an area where much increased functionality and safety will be gained and intra-vehicle integration may enable some of the other forms of integration identified below.
- *Between drivers and vehicles. Today the vehicle is controlled by the driver with little modification of the interaction between the vehicle and the driver. In particular, there is little ability to:

-Have the vehicle learn from past experience with this particular driver.

*Between passengers and vehicles.

*Among vehicles. This is one of the alternatives being considered by AHS which may accelerate trends which otherwise might occur more slowly but which are inevitable.

*Between vehicles and fleet managers for fleet management purposes.

*Between vehicles and cargo for safety reasons (there has been recent interest in this with respect to airplanes after

*Between transportation units (vehicles, trains, ships, planes, etc.), cargo, shippers, receivers and fleet managers for logistics purposes.

service, etc.).

There are many advantages to using a framework such as above. It helps to relate information technology to transportation at addressing. It helps to define public and private roles. It helps to keep our thinking broad rather than focused on particular systems or institutions. It may provide an alternative way of looking at and tabulating benefits and possibly cost-

Perhaps most importantly, it indicates that we can not ignore the vehicle. ITS will have only a minor impact on transportation if we view it as simply the modernization of traffic control centers and other public sector systems.

information technology to facilitate integration/interconnection/interactively as a complement/supplement to both the user service and market package frameworks for purposes of benefit assessment and also for creating a longer-term vision

fundamentally changed by information technology may be very helpful to transportation planners and legislators.

NEED FOR NEW SCENARIO PLANNING TOOLS

transportation system are subject to differences of opinion as is the relative effectiveness of ITS investment (compared to less information) in general and the various subsets (market packages, user services, etc.) of this technology.

Scenario planning provides a way of translating a myriad of possibilities into a smaller number of distinct scenarios each of which lends itself to analysis, i.e., how likely is each scenario and how should we respond to each scenario.

Factors to be considered in scenario planning for vehicle transportation might at a macro level include:

*VMT Growth

- Levels of individual VMT (mainly population growth and travel patterns, but of course there are other variables including mode shift).
- Levels of commercial VMT.
- At wholesale level mainly driven by economic activity.
- At retail level driven by economic activity but there is a driving force of electronic commerce which is substituting package delivery for consumer take-home of purchased goods.

*Ratio of ITS effectiveness to traditional transportation investments.

- Congestion and related areas.
- Safety.

Certainly scenario planning applies to transit as well as private vehicle transportation and here one of the key variables would be the growth in transit usage.

Planners are also interested in ITS effectiveness at a less macro level and might wish to focus on the individual ITS technologies. Scenario planning can address any variables of interest to the planner.

The advantage to scenario planning is that it deals with concepts and discrete values for variables. For many purposes and audiences, this is easier to accept than the complicated and often incomprehensible formulae that come out of modeling exercises. In reality, we are talking about the same thing, but scenario planning moves a technical approach into the realm of planners.

One of the nice features of this type of planning is that it can be at a national level or for each State, Metropolitan area or Congressional District.

I have faxed separately two examples using this technique. One is vehicle transportation example, the other a transit example tied to an institutional issue, namely, welfare reform. Of course both are hypothetical examples and the variables utilized, the potential outcomes of these variables, and the way that the cells in the matrix have been grouped into scenarios may not be valid for the two particular geographies that I selected. But hopefully these hypothetical scenario matrices demonstrate the approach.

Often just developing this scenario matrix helps people make decisions by transforming a myriad of variables into a smaller number of meaningful scenarios - some of which stand out as being more likely than others and, through their definition, are suggestive of the required actions needed to respond. The process of developing scenario matrices and discussing the initial versions of the matrix in a group setting often leads to increased clarity of the situation as the matrix is refined. I have found this process to be very effective in consensus building.

The matrix is constructed in a way (i.e., mutually exclusive outcomes for each dimension) that probabilities can be assigned to the outcomes, hence to each of the cells in the matrix, and by aggregation of the various scenarios. Sometimes this is important. I have developed a very simple approach to doing this forecasting, but there are many other approaches which can be utilized.

Having a good approach for forecasting outcomes, and hence, which scenarios are most likely, also allows for ongoing monitoring of the situation. We may initially project that certain outcomes are more likely than others and therefore certain scenarios are more likely. But events often unfold differently than we had forecast. The approach that I use, even though it is relatively simple, allows for ongoing reassessment of the situation.

An additional advantage is that once having established and gained consensus for the criteria to be used in assigning probabilities to outcomes and hence scenarios, both the initial assessment and future reassessments can be conducted without the rancorous debates that often surround such activities when they are conducted on the basis of who is most convincing or powerful.

I would recommend that scenario planning methodologies, including possibly the one that I have described in this communication, be disseminated to state and local planners and perhaps some training sessions should be arranged to assist in gaining familiarity with these approaches.

Perhaps we should seek language in the ISTEA Reauthorization that tasks USDOT or ITS-A, or perhaps each MPO, to perform the above or related scenario planning. Such scenario planning would provide an opportunity for input from the entire transportation community and other stakeholders.

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIO PLANNING MATRIX
Philadelphia Metropolitan Area - Year 2010
ITS Effectiveness Relative to New Construction Alternatives

VTM Average Annual Growth	1:00 or less	1.25 to 1	1.5 to 1	2 to 1
2% or Less	S1	S3	S2	
4%	S5	S4	S3	
6%			S4	S3

S1 = No Major Problem, Conventional Approaches Will Meet Demand

S2 = Cost of Meeting Demand Will Be less Than Currently Planned

S3 = Demand Will be Met at Current Expenditure Levels if ITS is Widely Deployed

S4 = Some Degradation in Mobility or Major Increase in Infrastructure Investment

S5 = Major Degradation in Mobility or Tremendous Increase in Infrastructure Investment

This matrix shows three possible outcomes for VMT growth and four possible outcomes for ITS relative effectiveness. This leads to twelve pairs of outcomes. The scenarios group pairs of outcomes which will have a similar impact on communities, thus simplifying the planning process to consideration of five different scenarios. It is possible to forecast the likelihood of each outcome pair and by aggregation, the likelihood of the associated scenario.

HYPOTHETICAL SCENARIO PLANNING MATRIX

Impact of Welfare Reform

Boston Metropolitan Area - Year 2005

Changes to Public Transit System

Number of Persons to be Incorporated into Workforce

be Incorporated into Workforce	Minimal	Improved Scheduling	Flexible Hours	Flexible Routes and Improved Scheduling
25,000 or Less		S2	S1	
25,001 to 50,000	S4			
Above 50,000			S3	

S1 = No Major Transportation Problems

S2 = Difficulties Associated With Coverage but not Capacity

S3 = Difficulties Associated With Capacity but not Coverage

S4 = Both Coverage and Capacity Difficulties

This matrix shows three possible mutually exclusive outcomes for desired/required employment growth of persons formerly on welfare and four possible mutually exclusive outcomes for transit system improvement. This leads to twelve pairs of outcomes. The scenarios group pairs of outcomes which will have a similar impact on welfare reform, thus simplifying the planning process to consideration of four different scenarios. It is possible to forecast the likelihood of each outcome pair and by aggregation, the likelihood of the four scenarios.